DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 218 SP 020 000

AUTHOR Royster, Preston M.; Chernay, Gloria J.
TITLE Teacher Education: The Impact of Federal Policy.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 222p.
AVAILABLE FROM Preston M. Royster, 6117 Wicklow Drive, Burke, VA 22015 ($6.95).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Demand; Educational History; Educational Needs; Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; *Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Land Grant Universities; Public Education; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

This book traces the history of public support of teacher education from its European beginnings to present practices in the United States. It summarizes current programs and analyzes the impact that federal assistance has had on teacher education programs in selected institutions of higher education. Chapter 1 presents an historical overview of teacher education and the evolution of teacher training. In chapter 2 the chronology of federal intervention in education, the growth of land grant colleges, universities, and polytechnic institutes, and the recognition of the need for improved teacher education are examined. The reasons for the expansion of federal intervention in education are considered in chapter 3, including the impact of technological advances and sociological, judicial, and legislative developments, and responses of the federal, state, and local governments to changes in social attitudes and priorities. Selected federal programs originating in the 1960s are described, including the Teacher Corps, Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, Education Professions Development Act, Career Opportunities Program, and Urban/Rural School Development Program. Chapter 4 reviews recent federal education programs and legislation, such as the Educational Personnel Development Act, teacher training programs, aid to populations with special needs, and vocational, adult, and career education programs. The success of selected federal projects in improving teacher education is examined in chapter 5. The final chapter looks at the present status of federal involvement in education and offers predictions for the future of federal aid for teacher education. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED2182218

TEACHER EDUCATION:

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL POLICY

Preston M. Royster

U. S. Department of Education

Gloria J. Chernay

George Mason University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Banister Press
P. O. Box 2124
Springfield, Virginia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Preston M. Royster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 020 000

Copyright © Banister Press 1981 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED, No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission of Banister Press.

Printed in The United States of America Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 81-71327.

ERRATA

Page 179

The first column after "Program or Practice" should read Bilingual Education

The second column should read Indian Education

The third column should read Special Education

The fourth column should read Teacher Corps

The fifth column should read Vocational Education

DEDICATION

to

Our children and boys and girls
everywhere who are entitled to
an excellent education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements are given to a number of people who were helpful to us in the preparation of the manuscript. There were some, particularly Vanetta Whitacker and Jeremy Burnham, who explored concepts with us and who reviewed the statistical data from the survey. Others such as Nancy Hofferberth, Jill Berkelhammer, and Rebecca Hanks gathered important resources for various chapters. Special recognition is given to Jane Taylor for her continuing moral support and nimble fingers and to Sean Murphy for his proofreading skill and incisive editing.

Thank you.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Preston M. Royster is currently the Deputy Director of Teacher Corps, the largest U.S. Department of Education program devoted solely to teacher education. In this position, he provides national leadership in the development of theories, practices and policies in educational professional development. Dr. Royster has held numerous positions of educational leadership which included service as Commissioner of Education, Region III, from 1976-1978 and researcher in family life and early childhood education. In addition, he serves as Rector of the Board of Visitors at one of Virginia's state universities.

His publications include writings on community involvement in teaching, teacher education, education of the blind, family life education and school desegregation.

Dr. Royster holds a Doctorate in Public Administration and the honorary Doctor of Laws (LLD) Degree.

Gloria Chernay is the Coordinator of Field Experiences and assistant professor at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia. She supervises the placement of students in the field-based teacher education programs and teaches graduate and undergraduate courses. As an educational consultant, Dr. Chernay has conducted programs in curriculum development, evaluation, and administration at local, state, and national levels. Also, she has been consultant to the U. S. Department of Education and other federal agencies.

She is an institutional representative for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, an officer in the George Mason chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, and a member of the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Association of Teacher Educators.

Dr. Chernay holds a bachelor's degree from Indiana State University, a master's degree from Indiana University, and Ph.D. in education from Michigan State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... vi

CHAPTER ONE: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION..... 1

Origins of Education..... 2
Preparation for Teachers..... 5
The Emergence of Education in America..... 8
Improving Teacher Training..... 12
The Science of Education/The Art of Learning..... 20
Initial State and Federal Involvement..... 23

CHAPTER TWO: INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION..... 33

Historical Perspective..... 34
Women's Problems..... 36
Chronology of Federal Concern for Education..... 37
Land Grant Colleges, Morrill Act, 1862..... 41
Programs..... 42
Need for More and Better Teachers..... 44
Polytechnic Institutes..... 45
The Growth of Universities..... 46
Transition..... 48
The National Science Foundation..... 51
NSF Impact on Teacher Education..... 52

CHAPTER THREE: REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION... 57

Federal, State and Local Involvement..... 58
Technological Advances..... 60
National Science Foundation..... 62
National Defense Education Act..... 66
Sociological Changes and Development..... 69
Judicial and Legislative Developments..... 81
Expansion of Federal Involvement in Education..... 85
Remediation of Deficiencies in Teaching..... 90
Teacher Corps..... 93
Experienced Teacher Fellowship Progam..... 94
Education Professions Development Act..... 95
Trainers of Teacher Trainers..... 98
Career Opportunities Program..... 101
Urban/Rural School Development Program..... 102

CHAPTER FOUR: RECENT FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS..... 111

Educational Personnel Development Act..... 113
Teacher Training Programs..... 120
Aid to Populations with Special Needs..... 125
Vocational, Adult and Career Education Programs..... 141

Other Programs with training Components..... 146

CHAPTER FIVE: THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS..... 167

Description of Study..... 169
Innovations..... 174
Institutionalization..... 178
Predictions of Future Programs..... 183

CHAPTER SIX: AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION... 189

Funding..... 191
Predictions for the Future..... 195
Conclusion..... 205

INTRODUCTION

The influence by federal legislation and federal funding on teacher education has fluctuated over the years depending on perceived national needs. In times of national crises when rapid responses are demanded, the federal government generally passes legislation that is responsive to these needs. Also, federal control of such programs is the norm. Technological and sociological reforms of the past twenty-five years are examples of responses to needs. At other times, the locus of control (in determining needs and responses) has rested with the states or with local education agencies. The purpose of this book is to review the influence of federal programs on teacher education from its early beginnings to current practices and to examine the parallels of control with national needs.

The book is of value to educators in a number of ways. For students in teacher education, it enables them to have a better understanding of the historical development of teacher education and to understand the need for political developments. It is of value to teacher educators in helping them to assess considerations that are necessary in advising federal policy makers on the types and nature of support that should be provided by federal agencies. Further, it helps teacher educators to understand political considerations that must be taken into account when projecting new training needs and strategies. Also, it is useful to public school systems in improving the quality of education for their students through professional development programs and through early involvement in pre-service programs. Specifically, this book is addressed to audiences in higher education who are developing experienced teachers and potential teachers, to project directors and program coordinators who could use the book as a guide for identifying federal teacher education programs that would meet specific needs of their students and institutions, and to school administrators and practicing teachers who are designing programs for their school systems and making arrangements to seek federal and other forms of financial and technical assistance.

Teacher Education: The Impact of Federal Policy traces the history of public support of teacher education from its European beginnings to present federal practices in the United States. It summarizes current categorical programs, and it analyzes the impact that federal assistance has had on teacher education programs in selected institutions of higher education. It concludes with a forecast of future directions in teacher education and the effect that federal aid may have upon teacher education in the future.

G.C.
P.R.

Chapter 1

1

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION

An examination of the history of teacher education also requires a close look at the history of education because of the close interrelationship between the two. In all of Western civilization, teacher education reform accompanied education reform. Traditionally, education, and therefore teacher education, made great strides during major political and religious reforms or when there were long periods of peace in which a nation could make great cultural advancements.

Educational reform occurred most readily when major institutions--religious, political, or economic--found it necessary to promote their ideologies. Institutional leaders knew that religious dogma and political philosophies could be embraced most quickly by a nation through the educative process. In the effort to educate children, new ways of training teachers developed rapidly as well. This was true in major religious movements when

priests and clerics were trained to teach, in major political movements, and in economic movements such as the rise of commercial enterprises during the Reformation. At times, the church and nation combined their educational efforts, and the effect of this was a more formalized system of education as well as a more rapid inculcation of beliefs. Also, great strides in education were made during the long periods of peace when a society was free to develop intellectually. New ways of *thinking* were accompanied by new ways of thinking about education. As educational theorists with common beliefs formalized their concepts, reforms in curriculum and teaching practices were joined by new movements in teacher training.

In this chapter, some trends will be reviewed that evolved into common teacher education practices known today. These include the evolvement of teacher education curriculum, licensing practices, and special schools and programs for training teachers. Understanding the origins and purposes of teacher education will provide an opportunity for a comparative review of past practices to current programs and to a perception of the future of teacher education. The purpose of this chapter primarily is to provide a general background of the historical development of teacher education in the Western world. No attempt is made to provide a detailed account of dates, places, or major personages involved.

ORIGINS OF EDUCATION

Education, as it is known today, originated in the Greek city-states as a means of preparing youth to become citizens. It was a means of perpetuating the culture--all those special institutions, knowledge, values, and communication which a society holds--and transmitting that culture from one

generation to the next. The Greeks are looked to as originators of education because they, more than any other early civilization, influenced current forms of Western culture and education.

Early Greek educators were not only responsible for developing new bodies of knowledge but also new ways of thinking. The intellectual foundations of education were formed along with political and economic developments. While the status of teaching varied, in general it was respected as a distinct profession. In later times, during the Roman Empire, teaching was carried on by secular teachers or by priests and other church leaders. Even though teaching was recognized as a profession, no specific training was provided to prepare teachers for their work. Instead, to be a teacher, a person "...studied under some recognized teacher and was then able to establish his own claim to be a teacher, to attract students, or to be appointed to a teaching position..." by a civic or religious leader.[1] Not until the Middle Ages were specific courses of study required for admission to the teaching profession.

During the Middle Ages, the practice of licensing teachers began because the church wanted to control the entrance of clerics to the teaching profession. The license to teach was granted to those who completed a liberal arts education in scholarship as well as religious orthodoxy. When the student completed a bachelor of arts degree, he received a license to be an assistant teacher. In order to become a master teacher, he had to study Aristotelian philosophy and higher liberal arts for three years. He was also required to write a thesis and defend it successfully in order to earn the master of arts degree. The first curriculum of this type was begun at the University of Paris in 1215.[2]

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION

At the time of the Renaissance, the primary methods of instruction were the same as they had been during the Middle Ages--lectures, memorization, and copying information from textbooks. While methods of teaching did not change, the education profession did undergo two significant changes. One was the controversy over control of education, and the other was a growing esteem for the education profession.

The secularism of the Renaissance brought about great changes in political and economic systems. Because of new educational needs, agencies other than the church attempted to gain control of education. These included town governments, secular rulers, private teachers, and voluntary endowment associations. In some towns public parochial schools emerged; in others, civic leaders created schools separate from religious institutions. Private teachers formed guilds as a means of protecting themselves and the right to teach. Voluntary foundations established schools and appointed boards of trustees who supervised secular teachers. These early forms of civil control became the foundations of public schools. New control of education was reflected in new curriculum which was developed to meet commercial interests. At the elementary level, vernacular schools prepared middle class children to engage in business affairs. In the secondary schools, older middle class students were provided classical Latin education in order to gain social access to the upper classes.[3]

While class distinction remained between elementary and secondary teachers during the Renaissance, teachers in general enjoyed growing public esteem. Financial support increased through the formation of the secular schools, and teaching came to be viewed as a full-time profession unrelated to the tasks of the priest as it had been in earlier periods.[4]

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION

The wars and persecutions of the Reformation had grave effects upon the progress of education. However, longer periods of peace and a growing sense of nationalism gave rise to national school systems. Teaching the vernacular language and building the spirit of nationalism became the major foci of the schools which were controlled by national churches while under the authority of the state.[5] National church/state control gave rise to several changes in education. The schools became part of the civil administration, compulsory attendance laws were instituted, and the two-part system of universal education became rife. The vernacular elementary education was provided for the lower classes and a classical secondary education for the upper classes.

Public support for education began with a series of poor laws which required churches to levy taxes to support the poor and to provide apprenticeships for poor children. Schools were public to the extent that funds and income were used to benefit the schools, and they were free to the extent that they were open to any students who could pay the tuition or secure a scholarship. Even with these restrictions, these schools provided the groundwork for later public schools.[6]

PREPARATION FOR TEACHERS

Special preparation for teachers became recognized as a need because of the combined interests of church and state. This ". . . led to the setting up of standards for the teaching profession and marked the beginnings of certification and examination of teachers by the state-church." Luther and other religious and civil leaders visualized a higher status and dignity for the teaching profession.[7] One such leader, St. Jean Baptiste de LaSalle, established the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and

through his school elevated elementary teaching to professional status. The teacher training schools provided lay persons with theoretical, religious, and practical training in preparation for teaching poor children. Education of the poor came to be recognized as a value to society and to religion. Other contributions of the Institute were providing instruction in the vernacular language, giving attention to an orderly and effective school atmosphere, and grouping students to graded classrooms.

Besides LaSalle, other educators of the Reformation contributed to the trend of improving teacher education. Richard Mulcaster supported the establishment of teacher training schools so that prospective teachers could learn methods of teaching adapted to the students' interest. And Johann Comenius developed a system of methodology applying the methods of science to educational theory, curriculum, and instructional methods. While Comenius did not greatly influence education in his own time because of the Thirty Years' War and religious persecution, his idea became the foundation of education and teacher education in other parts of Europe.[8]

August Hermann Franke, too, influenced the development of teacher education. He, like others before him, contributed to the humanitarian movement to help the poor as well as to promote religious doctrine. His institutions ranged from a vernacular elementary school, to the secondary Latin *Gymnasium* and the higher school *Pedagogium*--a scientific accademy--to the university-level teacher training institution. Franke's model gained support of the king of Prussia, and the concept of the national school system was further strengthened.

As national school systems developed, the training of teachers became more formalized. At Franke's institution, special attention was given to problems

 good quick overview

of prospective teachers. At Johann Hecker's *Realschule* teacher training seminars were conducted. The Humanists promoted the scholarly concept of teacher training by assuring that teachers had a strong foundation of classical scholarship. "It was assumed that all a good teacher needed was mastery of subject matter."[9] This philosophy was the beginning of what was to become a long battle both in Europe and America between those who held the concepts of professional versus academic teacher education programs.

Johann Pestalozzi, a Swiss educational theorist, not only introduced new theories about learning but also established a school that embodied his theories and practices. He introduced the theory of individual development which incorporated empiricism and naturalism while attending to psychological and religious sensitivities. In learning, he believed that children should proceed from the particular to the general knowledge from concrete to abstract experiences. This new approach was so thoroughly developed that it necessitated a new kind of teacher education because teachers needed to understand the nature of the child in order to guide his development and adjust instruction. "At last, school teaching could be looked upon as a profession that required special and professional preparation . . . ."[10]

Another educational philosopher and psychologist, Johann Herbart, further systematized the processes of methodology thus strengthening the need for teacher training institutions. He developed what became known as the five formal steps of learning and teaching. They are:

1. preparation - teacher prepares child's mind to receive new knowledge.
2. presentation - teacher presents new facts or material to the child.
3. associations - teacher relates new ideas to knowledge gained earlier.
4. generalization or abstraction - teacher assists child in formulating general principles by analyzing individual cases.

5. application - teacher provides experiences by referring general principles to specific examples or practical situations.

This systematic and scientific method became popular and spread throughout teacher training institutions in Europe and the United States. The new method had both positive and negative effects--positive for "professionalizing" education and negative for formalizing learning into a rigid pattern with very little latitude.[11]

While new educational theories affected teacher training, other changes, too, led to improvement of teaching as a profession both in Europe and America. The early to mid-nineteenth century saw the rise of normal schools, teacher-training institutions based on Pestalozzi's ideas with courses in theory, methods, and pedagogy. However, new political systems viewed the normal schools as a threat and the curriculum was reduced to the acquisition of subject matter. For the most part, the two-class system of education continued with elementary teachers receiving separate and inferior training and secondary teachers receiving university training. An apprenticeship system was established in England, and in Germany teachers served a probationary period before becoming "regular" teachers. In some European countries testing and licensing practices continued, and in others a person could teach simply by having acquired knowledge of subject matter.[12]

THE EMERGENCE OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Meanwhile, in America, formal education developed along the same lines as in Europe having been influenced by English liberalism and French humanitarianism. Three patterns of education emerged. New England common schools were classless, community-centered, and community-taxed, and the

curriculum was Bible study and college preparatory. In the mid-Atlantic states, education centered on Bible Study; it was church sponsored and taxless. And in the South, education took two forms--the aristocratic, tutored, ruling class schools for landowners and pauper schools for the poor.

Because different patterns of education existed in different geographical regions, different patterns of teacher education emerged as well. In the South, it was common for people to become teachers who had a liberal education themselves. In the mid-Atlantic region, academies grew. One of the first was the Academy of Philadelphia begun by Benjamin Franklin in 1751. It was comparable to the Latin grammar school but had a broader program of studies. English was the language of instruction, and in addition to the classics, some vocational education was taught. Graduates of the academies possessed minimal practical teaching skills. Academies like Franklin's, which were usually private schools supported by tuition and grants, were the forerunners of normal schools and teachers colleges. In the Northeast, a different need arose. Because of the diversity of backgrounds and the lack of common culture and philosophies, educators felt a need to unite the thinking of people of that region by introducing the common school. This, in turn, gave rise to the need for common training of teachers which resulted in the establishment of the normal schools.[13]

Tax-supported public schools were perceived as a means of achieving democratic ideals. While not implemented fully in the nineteenth century, the foundations of free public schools were laid. Prospective teachers were trained in liberal arts colleges and academies. One of the first academies was chartered as a private corporation by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia. The academy offered a wide range of subjects from which students could choose

in preparation for a profession. Franklin's theory was to combine a classical and a practical education. Because of classical tradition and stringent college-entrance requirements, Franklin's academy evolved into another college-preparatory institution; however, the initial step had been made to incorporate practical, modern, and scientific studies into the schools. Later academies which followed his plan but included "...not only the classical, the practical, and the scientific, but the religious as well..." became the most successful academies. These academies of the late eighteenth century were supported by tuition and church endowments. States added public support as they became the teacher training centers of their time.[14]

The normal school movement which was so instrumental in training teachers in America in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries originated in Europe in the late seventeenth century. Initially, the schools were begun by the Calvinists, Puritans, and Catholic teaching orders to assure that religious orthodoxy was not neglected in the schools. Basically the schools provided training for elementary teachers. In addition to religion, the curriculum included reading, writing, and arithmetic as well as practical and vocational training. Teacher preparation was improved by applying science to educational methods and by institutionalizing the teacher training process. The normal school movement in America will be addressed more fully in subsequent pages.

In addition to the normal schools and teacher training institutes mentioned earlier, other forms of schooling occurred at the same time. These rose from needs created by the industrial revolution and were considerably less effective but deserve attention because for many people it was the only education available to them. Generally, the upper and middle classes did not

favor education of the poor because they feared that the poor would no longer be content with their roles. Nevertheless, a sense of philanthropy and a concern for unattended children led to the formation of dame schools and common schools. While the dame school frequently provided less than adequate instruction, for a small fee a housewife would look after the neighborhood children and teach them the rudiments of reading, writing,and arithmetic, as well as manners and religious catechism.

Education in the common schools was somewhat more formalized but did not enjoy the prestige of the grammar schools and academies. Primarily they were private schools, and the teachers were tradesmen who possessed only minimal academic skills themselves. Frequently, the elementary teacher came from the same social class as the children he taught.[15] This was especially harmful to the poor classes where the teacher stayed only slightly ahead of the pupils, but it was desired by the middle and upper classes and, in effect, kept the poor "in their place."

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, teachers were recognized for their contributions to the church and to the community. It was expected that a teacher would possess high moral character and perform competently in the classroom. Since teaching was recognized as a profession, teachers were not expected to subsidize their incomes with other work, which resulted in incredibly insufficient salaries. The community recognized the teacher's social worth, but he was rarely well-compensated for his work. The low esteem of the teaching profession may have been due, in part, to the poor quality of preparation for teaching. Frequently, those students who graduated from colleges and academies with the lowest scholastic ranking became teachers. In church schools, ministers and laymen taught academics as an add-on to their

religious duties. Apprentices with no academic training became teachers by serving with a schoolmaster. In many places in America, slaves and indentured servants were trained to teach. The fact that civic leaders relegated teaching to those who were considered lower class (or in the case of slaves, no recognized class) and the fact that teachers were inadequately prepared in didactics is evidence of this low esteem.

The teacher's condition was described succinctly by Edgar Castle in *The Teacher* as he quoted and summarized comments made by Francois Guizot who sponsored the education act of 1833 in France:

> Guizot... candidly admitted that 'the resources at the disposal of public authority will never succeed in rendering the humble profession of village teacher as attractive as it is useful....It is necessary that a profound sense of moral importance of work sustain and animate him.' In this spirit the administrators of the century were committed to raising the standards and qualifications of teachers without raising their pay.[16]

IMPROVING TEACHER TRAINING

In England, increasing the qualifications for teachers gave rise to the need for the improvement of teacher training. In addition to the increasing number of normal schools, a system of apprenticeship was established where promising pupil-teachers were apprenticed to their masters. Besides this practical experience, the students' curriculum included a minimum of liberal arts, elementary subject matter, and methods conforming to Herbart's Five Steps.[17]

The history of teacher education in America reflects the same trends that occurred in Europe. In the early stages of our nation's development, training considered appropriate for future teachers was the classical liberal arts curriculum. It was believed here, as in Europe, that if a person had

sufficient knowledge of subject matter, he could teach. In an effort to develop and improve teachers' skills, the Connecticut State Board of Education under the secretary, Henry Barnard, conducted the first teacher's institute in Hartford in 1839. The purpose of the institute was to help inexperienced teachers to gain the following skills: "...knowledge of subject matter, organize presentations logically, acquaint themselves with school management, and acquire professional interests."[18] Later, reading circles were formed in an effort to improve the literary background of teachers. Members of the reading circles were provided with selected books, study guides, and discussion questions. Activities such as these improved the professionalism of teachers in America, but as normal schools and institutions of higher education assumed more responsibility for teacher training, the need for institutes and reading circles diminished.

Gradually, the philosophies of Pestalozzi, Herbart, and other European thinkers took hold in America. "The demand for sequenced classes, age grading, small homogeneous classes, and more effective teaching and curricula eventually led to the recognition of the need for pedagogical training and, in turn, to the establishment of the first normal schools."[19] As the need for teachers grew rapidly, colleges and universities entered the business of teacher education. However, their programs reflected the belief that the art of scholarship was equal to, and often more important than, the art of instruction.

As certification requirements were adopted by an increasing number of states, the need for in-service summer sessions rose. One of the first sessions was the summer adult education program in Chautauqua, New York. Shortly thereafter, in 1880, four major institutions of higher education--

Harvard, Amherst, Wisconsin, and Indiana -- implemented summer inservice programs. By 1900, summer in-service was prospering throughout the United States, and by World War I, summer in-service was available to nearly all teachers. Several problems arose from university-controlled in-service, however. The emphasis on scholarship remained intact; the traditional delivery systems of classes, lectures, and assigned readings, assignment of credit hours, and traditional standards for promotion which were applied to in-service faculty members were responsible for the lack of coordination between academic programs and field work. So while teachers were fulfilling the requirements for credit hours and certification, as long as control of in-service rested with the university, the need of teachers to increase their classroom expertise was not met as it has been envisioned by Barnard and others in the past century.[20]

In a summary of teacher education, Merle Bow acknowledged that teacher education was one of the oldest functions of the liberal arts colleges and universities. It was generally accepted in medieval times that the classical liberal arts curriculum followed by an apprenticeship was appropriate preparation for teaching, that the liberal arts degree guaranteed admission to the teacher guild, and that there was no such thing as the science of education. While certain educational theorists, some of whom were discussed earlier, disputed this and in fact created teacher education schools, for the most part, the concept of teacher education was not widely accepted. This attitude remained throughout the colonial period and early national periods in America. At that time, preparation to teach did not include professional technique, and it was not separate from liberal culture studies. A new school of thought emerged, and "...education--the study of human development, the

learning process, and man's educational institutions--was a legitimate enterprise within the older framework of liberal studies."[21] Education was viewed as a social science with schools being studied as a social institution. Still, professional teacher training was not common practice.

Gradually, however, the normal school assumed responsibility for teacher training. Initially, the curriculum relied heavily upon liberal arts including the study of the principles of philosophy and psychology. It established the ideal of teaching as a profession. Ultimately, the normal school program became highly technical with immediate practical results as the expected outcome.

Normal Schools

In America, formalized teacher education began in a private normal school, the Columbian School, in Concord, Vermont, in 1823. Samuel R. Hall, a Congregational minister, was the first principal. Hall believed that certain personal characteristics were more important for teaching than the knowledge of subject matter or the sharing of that knowledge with others. His list of qualifications were "...common sense, uniformity of temper, a capacity to understand and discriminate character, possession of decision of character, affectionateness, and moral discernment."[22] In an attempt to solve problems of inexperienced teachers, Hall wrote the first teachers manual, *Hall's Lectures on Schoolkeeping.*

The first state-supported teacher training institution, the Lexington Normal School, was established in 1839 by Horace Mann who, at that time was secretary of the Massachusetts State Department of Education. One year of study was required to qualify as a teacher.

In a letter to Henry Barnard, Cyrus Pierce, the first principal,

expressed what he considered the two basic aims of the normal school"...to teach *thoroughly* the principles of the several branches studied..." and "...to teach the pupils, by my own *example*, as well as by *precepts*, the *best way of teaching the same things* effectually to others."[23] Throughout the letter, Pierce referred to the "art" of teaching thus raising teaching to professional status rather than the vocational level as it was viewed by most people. Frequently, he required students to recite as if they were teachers, acting in the capacity of teachers, adopting the style of a teacher, and thus mingling theory and practice. In this way, Pierce's students learned the art of teaching.

Mary Swift, a student of Pierce's recorded in a journal her reactions the first time she was called upon to recite the teacher role.

> The feeling caused by asking the first question tended rather to excite my risibles, but feeling the necessity for sobriety--I was enabled to play the teacher for a short time. I think that he can judge very little about our idea of teaching from the example which we give him in hearing a recitation for the manner in which it is carried on depends very much upon the interest felt by the teacher in the scholars and in their study.[24]

While Mary concluded her entry with a perceptive thought about pupil-teacher relationships, she appeared to realize the significance of the experience as she felt both excited and serious about playing the teacher.

The curriculum consisted of four major areas:

1. Subject matter fields--math, language, and so on.
2. Professional education courses--didactics and pedagogics, and later, educational psychology, history of education, theories of learning, and methods of teaching.
3. Professional education or cultural development courses.
4. "Training" or laboratory school experiences.[25]

Each week Pierce lectured on one aspect of teaching such as discipline, management, or methods. He also conducted informal discussions, and once a

week there was a debate on the principles of education. There were reading, spelling, and math lessons. Geography was taught by units with each student contributing some part of the whole unit. In addition, moral instruction was provided.

Students received practical experience at a model school which was an annex to the Normal School. When Pierce determined that a student was adequately prepared, the student was permitted to work in the school on a one-month rotating basis. One acting superintendent and two assistants performed instructional and management duties. Twice each day Pierce observed in the school and directed the student teachers' work.[26] This model of teacher preparation spread throughout the Northeast and eventually throughout the country.

Perhaps the one unique quality that Pierce initiated at the Normal School was developing in his students a commitment to education and a recognition of the responsibility they would have as teachers. Mary Swift's journal entries reveal that she gave considerable thought to these matters. She identified desirable qualities of teachers and described the methods by which a teacher should manage a classroom. About qualities, she said that a teacher should have health, fair reputation, good standing in the community, and well-balanced mind "...free from eccentricities and from the infirmities of genius." Also, she mentioned the following attributes of a good teacher: deep interest in children, "...patience, mildness, firmness, and perfect self control...nice moral discrimination, a high sense of moral responsibility and accountability." Regarding management, she said,

> Teachers should be acquainted with their difficulties, and know how to surmount them. The government (of the classroom) should be just, uniform, and impartial. All rules should be made so that the pupils can see they are for their good, and the reasons for making them

> should be explained. Teachers should be well-acquainted with the (academic) branches they are to teach.[27]

Mary recognized the importance of a well-prepared teacher. She indicated in one entry the great responsibility of teaching by saying that if a teacher is inadequate, the consequences are felt not only by the poorly educated child but that the errors are transmitted to his children as well. If Mary's thoughts were typical of other students in the school, then there is clear evidence that Pierce was successful at what he set out to do, to inculcate in students a respect for the "art" of teaching and to fill them with his philosophy and practice of "good" teaching.

Twelve years after the Normal School began, Henry Barnard asked Cyrus Pierce to evaluate his work and to respond to several questions about teacher education. In his response, Pierce identified what he considered to be generally accepted principles of education and stated that these could be learned best in professional schools for teachers such as the Normal School. In conclusion, he stated what the professionally trained teacher should be able to do.

> In conclusion, allow me to recapitulate. It was my aim, and it would be my aim again, in a Normal School, to raise up for our common schools especially, a better class of teachers,--teachers who would not only teach more and better than those already in the field, but who would govern better; teachers, who would teach in harmony with the laws of juvenile development, who would secure diligent study and good lessons and sure progress, without a resort to emulation and premiums, and good order from higher motives than the fear of the rod or bodily pain; teachers, who could not only instruct well in the common branches, as reading, writing arithmetic, e.c., but give valuable information on a variety of topics, such as accounts, history, civil institutions, political economy, and physiology; bring into action the various powers of children, and prepare them for the duties of practical life; teachers, whose whole influence on their pupils, direct and indirect, should be good, tending to make them, not only good readers, geographers, grammarians, arithmeticians, e.c., but good scholars, good children, obedient, kind, respectful, mannerly, truthful; and in due time, virtuous, useful citizens, kind

> neighbors, highminded, noble, pious men and women. And this I attempted to do by inculcating the truth in the art of teaching and governing,--the truth in all things; and by giving them a living example of it in my own practice.[28]

Higher Education

In the late eighteenth century, liberal arts colleges in America were undergoing revisions in organization. Two branches emerged. One allowed for more specialized study of the arts, science, and philosophy, and the other prepared students for the practical application of knowledge. In this reorganization process, teacher education appeared and along with it the argument as to whether education is a liberal art or a science. By the end of the eighteenth century, the curriculum had expanded and had become more functional, and this gave rise to the elective system where students could specialize in one field.

Meanwhile the number of academies and public secondary schools increased, and their course offerings were comparable to liberal arts colleges. This freed the colleges to become centers for educational research and to promote the concept of professional education. This resulted in the increase of new knowledge about learning and teaching.

Near the end of the nineteenth century, scholars began to argue that "...education--the study of human development, the learning process, and man's educational institutions--was a legitimate enterprise..." within the framework of liberal arts. While Charles Eliot supported the movement toward an expanded curriculum, he had reservations about including education. Ultimately, however, he did establish a chair of pedagogy at Harvard.

The trend toward normal schools as teacher training institutions gained further momentum as American teacher educators studied more in Europe, and the commitment grew not only to make the normal school a single-purpose

institution, but also to raise it from the secondary school level to an institution of higher education. One of the first to be raised to the collegiate level was the Illinois Normal School under the presidency of Richard Edwards described the distinguishing characteristics of the normal school. First of all, its special objective was for the preparation of teachers. Secondly, it was to foster a professional spirit. After studying the principles of education, students were encouraged to form their own opinions and construct their own theories of education. Thirdly, it provided instruction in "...the science of education and the art of teaching." And lastly, the normal school was to extend the influence of the free schools. Because state authority assumed responsibility for the common school, and education was readily accessible to more students, in turn more teachers were needed, and the normal school, or teacher's college as Edwards referred to it, fulfilled the demand for more teachers.[29]

THE SCIENCE OF EDUCATION/THE ART OF TEACHING

By the end of the nineteenth century, normal schools were common for the training of teachers. However, a new movement in teacher education was emerging. Charles Kendall Adams and others advocated education as a field of study in colleges and in universities. They believed that teachers needed to be prepared for educational leadership as well as for pedagogical craftsmanship. Again, this reflected Edwards' phrase, "...the science of education and the art of teaching." Adams developed a model which in many ways is comparable to contemporary teacher education programs. In addition to knowledge of subject areas, he proposed four components:

1. History of Education

2. Philosophy of Education - the analysis and discussion of several theories, and teaching pedagogy as a science.

3. Methods in the School Room - the art of teaching and governing instructional methods, practice, school management, grading, and arranging courses.

4. The Teachers Seminary - the examination and discussion of problems of teaching, a comparative study of education systems.[30]

The importance of practice teaching grew with the normal school movement. A period of student teaching was an accepted and common component of teacher education programs by the turn of the century. In 1904, John Dewey stressed the relationship between theory and practice. He advocated laboratory experiences as a means of integrating subject matter preparation with professional instruction and relating instruction and educational theory to student teaching. The best practice teaching was affiliated with subject matter and with the science, philosophy and history of education.

Practical experience for education students was in keeping with his philosophy of progressive education. While he believed that instruction in the basic subjects was necessary, he emphasized the importance of individualized, experiential learning. The idea that children learn best through active participation carried over to his attitude about training teachers. He believed that not only should teachers learn how to prepare children for active participation in learning, but that they, too, should learn by the same method.

The Rise of Professionalism

The pure normal schools originated in the northeast in the pre-Civil War era. As in Europe, creation of the normal schools was a response to the increase of common schools. The common schools, as in Europe, were created

for social and civic purposes -- to educate the masses with a common ideology. When Horace Mann became Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, he was concerned about the threat of group conflict. At that time there was minimal centrality of thought because of the lack of education among the working classes, the rural people, and immigrants. Public education in the common schools would bring together children from all economic, religious, and ethnic groups where teaching would be dedicated to moral and civic education. The existing secondary schools and colleges could not begin to fill the need for more teachers. Therefore, Mann in Massachusetts, Henry Barnard in Connecticut, and others created the normal schools in response to the need to train teachers rapidly and adequately.

The recognition of teaching as a profession grew slowly, but it was aided by the formation of the normal schools. Preparing teachers in existing academies and colleges was not suitable because of the nontechnical focus of liberal education. On the other hand, the normal school had as its primary purpose the training of teachers, and it provided opportunities for people who could not otherwise pursue advanced study. The early normal schools did not develop into advanced professional schools, but they were able to inculcate in their students a sense of mission and dedication to service through teaching. This was apparent in entries from Mary Swift's journal which was noted earlier. Pride of craft and *esprit de corps* of teachers which was created in the normal schools led to the recognition of teaching as a profession.

Isolation of students in the normal schools and the development of a specialized body of knowledge gave teaching a sense of professionalism. However, by 1900, the liberal and professional traditions were coming together

in the universities. Three sets of attitudes emerged regarding the relationship of liberal and professional components. The first was the singleness of purpose -- liberal studies *or* professional studies. The second held that there was no distinction, that curriculum and methods could be reorganized to serve both liberal and professional ends. The third set of attitudes recognized the distinction and proposed that liberal *and* professional studies should begin early in the student's training and continue throughout the program.[31] This, then, would result in a teacher who was not only professionally competent but also who possessed a broad range of knowledge.

INITIAL STATE AND FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT

Responsibility of the State

The concept of state colleges and universities was accepted only after public education was accepted as a function of the state. While public education varied from state to state it was acknowledged that each state was responsible for its educational program and that each state "...should accept responsibility for the certification of teachers and for their tenure and welfare."[32]

As time went on, the training of teachers increasingly became a function of the state. The need for more teachers arose from the fact that more common schools made education more accessible to a greater number of children. This brought about an increase in the number of public normal schools under state control. In 1920, William Learned and William Bagley described the purposes of the normal school which were to train teachers and to be wholly responsive to the needs of the state. They stated that the normal school was not a

college for general culture but a vocational institution to prepare teachers to teach in the public schools. (The catalog of the "People's College" in 1910 stated that "under the law its students declare their intention to teach in the public schools.") They said that the normal school's function was an instrument of the state, that it was obligated to the state for the benefit of all the people, and that its charge was to provide public servants to discharge the "...obligation of society to the next generation."[33] Therefore, the teacher's role became more clearly defined as a public servant, and even though normal schools were recognized as institutions of higher education, licensing requirements placed the teacher education curriculum under state authority.

In the early Twentieth Century, normal schools evolved into state teachers colleges and state colleges of education. Some liberal arts colleges added teacher education as part of the program. Controversies arose over the nature of teacher education. One view held that knowledge of subject matter was the only prerequisite for teaching. The opposing view was that methods courses were necessary in addition to subject matter courses. For those who held the second view, another question arose, that is, should professional courses be taught after the liberal education at the postbaccalaureate level or should there be a combination of liberal arts and professional education throughout the students' college career.[34] In general, this question remains unresolved although it is the trend at most institutions to combine liberal and professional education.

The curriculum for teacher education programs became more specialized as certification requirements increased. In 1946, the Commission on Teacher Education identified the four basic components of comprehensive teacher

education programs. They were general education, advanced subject matter preparation, professional education (including general courses, child growth and development, social understanding, creative expression, instructional units), and participation through direct experiences and student teaching.[35] While specific requirements vary from state to state and school to school, these basic components are still the essence of teacher education today.

The Beginning of Federal Involvement

From the early periods of nationalism onward, responsibility for public education rested with the states. The Tenth Amendment stated that powers not specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution were reserved for the states. Since education was not mentioned in the Constitution, authority for public education became the responsibility of the states. However, the federal government has always shown an interest in education, and as early as Washington's first address to Congress there has been a desire for federal involvement in education. In his address, Washington encouraged support of higher education through "...aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place of deliberations of the Legislature."[36] The federal government has been involved in education through both formal and informal agencies, through influential groups of lobbyists, and through the media. Examples of direct formal influence are the Supreme Court's decision in the Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education case and in decisions involving services to nonpublic schools. In his chapter on government and education, Burrup stated that the federal government should maintain an interest in education but that its function should be advisory.

This leaves each governing body in an awkward position: the national government has the money, local governments have the problems, and the states have the legal powers.

The following table illustrates the Constitutional authority for education.[37]

Legal Authority	Statement	Practical Effect
First Amendment	Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...	Has made public education free from religious control.
Tenth Amendment	The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people.	Education has become a state function and responsibility
Fourteenth Amendment	No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law...	The basis of our free schools. Equality of educational opportunity for all. Applies the First Ammendment to the states.
Article 1 of the Constitution, Section 8	The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes...and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.....	The basis for federal interest in and federal aid to education.

The phrase, "...provide for the...general welfare..." has been the basis of federal involvement in education throughout our nation's history. The Northwest Ordinance provided for reserving a lot in every township for the maintenance of public schools. This was the beginning of federal involvement in education. Later legislative acts included the formation of the Military

and Naval Academies, a Department of Education, and land grant colleges. In 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act initiated the partnership in education between state and federal governments, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was one of the contemporary pieces of legislation to authorize federal support for teacher training. More recent ones are Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers legislation. These and other federal acts impacting directly upon teacher education will be discussed more fully in a later chapter.

The first United States Department of Education was established in 1867 for the purpose of collecting statistics, providing education information, and assisting in the development and maintenance of school systems throughout the country. Although the charge to the Department seemed great, the role of the commissioner of education was largely advisory in nature. Henry Barnard, a school reformer in both Connecticut and Rhode Island, was the first commissioner. The Department of Education was not a cabinet level department, and it was affiliated with different agencies as a "bureau" and as an "office" until 1953 when it was assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Services of the Office of Education fell into three categories:

1. The historical functions of collecting statistics and facts to show the progress of education.
2. The administrative function of overseeing grants to state education agencies, institutions of higher education, and local education agencies.
3. The professional service function providing assistance to other departments and government agencies.[38]

Technical and sociological advances of the 1950's and 1960's resulted in increases in federal aid to education. This, in turn, expanded the role of the Office of Education. The Office no longer merely reflected American education, it took an active role in establishing educational policies and

providing leadership in developing new knowledge about education. This occurred in several ways--through advisory commissions, research in education, and new pre-service and in-service models of teacher education.

Since 1980, the administration of federal education programs and policies has been conducted through the Department of Education. Because it is a new Cabinet-level department, its role is not clearly defined. Further, the current administration holds to a different philosophy than the previous one in which the Department was formed. Therefore, the future of the Department is not clear, though it is almost certain that the federal government will continue to maintain its interest in education in some form.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION

FOOTNOTES

[1]R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955), p. 91.

[2]Ibid., p. 160.

[3]Ibid., pp. 172-175.

[4]Ibid., p. 176.

[5]Ibid., p. 196.

[6]Ibid., pp. 209-211.

[7]Ibid., p. 212.

[8]Ibid., pp. 213, 237-239.

[9]Ibid., pp. 274-294.

[10]Ibid., pp. 398-400.

[11]Ibid., pp. 404-406.

[12]Ibid., pp. 373-379.

[13]Percy E. Burrup, The Teacher and the Public School Systems. (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 55, 56.

[14]op. cit., pp. 330-332.

[15]Edgar Bradshaw Castle, The Teacher (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 192.

[16]Ibid., p. 183.

[17]Ibid., p. 194.

[18]Robert E. Grinder, "Historical Overview of Inservice Practices in the United States," in The Institutionalization of Change and Inservice in Schools and Colleges of Education, ed. Paul Randy Walker (Washington: ERIC

Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May, 1978), p. 14.

[19]Ibid., p. 13.

[20]Ibid., p. 14-15.

[21]Merle L. Borrowman, Teacher Education in America (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1965), p. 11.

[22]Burrup, op.cit., 7.

[23]Borrowman, op. cit., p. 60.

[24]Ibid., p. 57.

[25]Burrup, op.cit., pp. 8-9.

[26]Borrowman, op.cit., pp. 61-64.

[27]Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[28]Ibid., p. 73.

[29]Ibid., pp. 74-83.

[30]Ibid., pp. 90-91.

[31]Ibid., pp. 25-26.

[32]Burrup, op.cit., p. 63.

[33]Borrowman, op.cit., pp. 184-206.

[34]Burrup, op.cit., p. 9.

[35]Borrowman, op.cit., pp. 224-251.

[36]Burrup, op.cit., p. 58.

[37]Ibid., p. 54

[38]Ibid., p. 145.

REFERENCES

James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGray-Hill, 1963).

Edgar Wallace Knight, Education in the United States (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969).

Allan C. Ornstein, Education and Social Inquiry (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1978).

Chapter 2

2

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

In an era when horse-drawn carriages, bicycles built for two, minstrel shows, and barber shop singing were in their heyday, both the music and politics reflected the spirit of a growing nation. There was a simple, sincere faith that what our forefathers had created was good. Education, per se, was handled by the individual states and relatively few people were interested in making any changes in it. Lacking, too, were any federal funds for educators.

Reasons for the meager federal funding tended to be more political than constitutional, for the United States Constitution is silent in the area of education because education was not a public function at the time of adoption. Later in the Nineteenth Century, when public elementary and secondary schools began to develop, local and state governments set all educational policy; the federal government showed little interest in playing a role.[1]

Yet, in spite of the lack of federal funds, the schools, over the years, had been expected to perform various social functions which were felt to be vital to the national interests.

> Americans at various times have expected the schools to inculcate religious orthodoxy, to instill moral virtue, to develop rationality or 'critical thinking,' to educate for the productive use of leisure time, and to enrich the affective life. They have been called upon to teach order, discipline, and democracy, the virtues of thrift, cleanliness, and honest labor, the evils of alcohol, tobacco, atheism, drugs, war, peace, sex, and communism; and they have been asked to help acculture immigrants, to foster patriotism, tolerance, and, above all, to produce a universally high standard of literacy. All this the schools sometimes did and still do.[2]

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The original American Dream included American faith in education. Colonists hurried to establish schools to preserve their cherished traditions in the midst of building changes in the New World. The founding fathers verbally expressed great concern for an educational system to support the infant republic. The old-world educational system simply did not fit into a society which demanded a practical education for its citizens. After the Civil War, progressivists worked hard to enlist support from the schools for social reform. Universal education had been viewed as an important element in social melioration from the Jacksonian days, if not even before that, right on down through the Twentieth Century.[3]

Colonists founded schools for religious motives, because they felt all men should be able to read the Word of God. In the late Eighteenth Century, virtues were to be taught in school. Noah Webster wrote in 1796, "Education forms the moral character of men, and morals are the basis of government."

Secular concerns were also very important in the American educational faith. It was said that the schools offered the ultimate promise of equality

and opportunity; that they made it possible for American society to remain somehow immune from the economic and social ills that plague the rest of mankind; that they, in short, provided a guarantee of an open society. As Horace Mann summarized it in 1848 in his annual report as secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, the school for all classes could be "... a great equalizer of the conditions of men, the balance wheel of the social machinery... It does better than disarm the poor of their hostility toward the rich: It prevents being poor."[4]

Some felt the schools were vital to the great American "melting pot" for cultural assimilation. But, in spite of their faith in the schools, many Americans feared too much "book larnin." Schools were felt to be most useful if they taught job-related skills, practical skills, not to fill minds with "useless facts." Henry Ford's advocacy of this position was typical: "The best that education can do for a man is to put him in possession of his powers, give him control of the tools with which destiny had endowed him, and teach him how to think."

Good citizenship was also an area where schools were to make an impact. J.L.M. Curry, writing in 1884, asserted, "Education should be so conducted as to make good, law-abiding, self-supporting, productive people...Without it, the functions of citizenship cannot...be safely discharged, or the just expectations of American citizen be realized. The educated citizen becomes a bulwark of society as he has a stake in public order and welfare."

Horace Mann, who single-handedly accomplished more for American education than any other man of his century, won the attention of people across the country. He lived to see his views vindicated in many ways: flourishing teachers' seminaries (these were private institutions, of course), a longer

school year, a doubling of state appropriations to education, enlarged libraries, compulsory school legislation, and a renewed interest in educational questions. But most importantly, it was clear by the middle of the Nineteenth Century that free, compulsory common schools were to become a permanent part of the American educational structure.[5]

WOMEN'S PROBLEMS

Women had their own special problems to deal with in order that they be able to pursue formal training above the elementary school level. Small colleges were guaranteed a future for they accepted women when the larger universities refused to meet women's educational needs.

This resistance to the education of women continued for decades. Even when permission was granted for co-education at established schools, it was given grudgingly and on a limited basis. Two exceptions to this rule were Oberlin College in Ohio and Antioch College under President Horace Mann.

> The one place where women could receive postsecondary instruction was in a normal school (forerunner to teacher training colleges). Coincident with the growth of common schools (forerunner to public schools), an awareness developed of the need for better teacher-training facilities. Samuel Hall's *Lecture to School-Masters on Teaching* (1883) written during his tenure as head of the normal department at Phillips Andover Academy, drew attention to the need for more centers where teachers could be prepared to work in lower schools. Under the pressure generated by people like Walter Johnson, Thomas Gallaudet, James G. Carter, and Horace Mann, teacher education programs were expanded drastically. Massachusetts in the late 1830's and New York in the early 1840's assumed the lead, followed later by the Midwestern and Western states. Normal schools, properly speaking, did not offer a collegiate or university education. The typical curriculum lasted two years and only later was expanded to four. The level of instructors in most teachers' seminaries (including the better normal schools) was definitely inferior to that given in either private colleges or state universities. Eventually pedagogy became an established area of scholarly study and teacher training assumed its rightful place within universities' professional divisions, but those developments were a post-Civil War phenomenon."[6]

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

CHRONOLOGY OF FEDERAL CONCERN FOR EDUCATION

The origin of initial federal concern is interesting for it reflects what was most vital to the early citizens of the United States. The issue of the separation of church and state is the major pitfall around which presidents and congressmen have detoured. Since the United States Constitution says nothing about the federal government's responsibility for education, the rationale has been the Constitution's Article I, which grants Congress the power to spend tax money for the common defense and general welfare of the country. The chronology below, not intended to be all inclusive, gives the dates of origin of major federal educational policies and programs. Some were temporary or discontinued policies and activities. This chronology, in a sense, summarizes what was educationally important to the politicians of that time.

1777 Initiation of direct Federal administration of educational programs, with instruction of military personnel, including schooling in mathematics.

1785 Commencement of aid to territories and later to states for education, by endowment of schools with public lands.

1787 Commencement of endowment of public institutions of higher education with public lands.

1800 First congressional appropriation for books, which became the nucleus of the Library of Congress.

1802 Establishment of the first federal institution of higher education--the Military Academy at West Point.

1804 Start of federal provisions for education in the District of Columbia.

1824 Establishment of the first Army special service school--the start of a large system now providing education up to the college graduate level.

1845 Establishment of the Naval Academy at Annapolis--the second federal institution of higher learning.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

1862 The first Morrill Act--initiation of the federal policy of aid to states for agricultural and industrial education through land grants to colleges.

1867 Creation by Congress of a federal Department of Education--later the Office of Education, serving education at all levels.

1879 Establishment of a federal school for engravers--probably the beginning of formal in-service training for federal civilian personnel, now including formal education at many institutions.

1890 The second Morrill Act--introduction of a policy of federal money grants to Black colleges for college instruction in special subjects. Special preparation of instructors in agriculture, mechanic arts, and home economics was included in this act.

1901 Establishment of the Army War College.

1911 Beginning of federal aid to states for nautical schools, now degree-granting institutions; introduction of the principle of federal-state matching of funds for education.

1915 Establishment of the Coast Guard Academy, now a degree-granting institution.

1916 Initiation of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps program at colleges and universities.

1917 The Smith-Hughes Act--beginning of federal policy of promoting vocational education below the college level.

1918 Initiation of rehabilitation training for disabled veterans.

1920 Organization of the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture.

1920 The Smith-Bankhead Act--initiation of the policy of federal-state cooperation in vocational rehabilitation, including education for persons disabled in industry.

1926 Establishment of the Contact Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, similar to the Army ROTC.

1933 Establishment of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration which supported various educational programs.

1935 Establishment of the National Youth Administration which gave part-time employment aid to college students.

1936 Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations--U. S. entrance into broad-scale international educational exchanges.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

1937 National Cancer Institute Act--beginning of policy of granting public health service fellowships.

1937 Creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps which provided vocational education.

1939 The Civilian Pilot Training Act--provision for federal cooperation with colleges in civilian pilot training.

1940 Selective Service Act--deferments at the discretion of local and state boards encouraged students to become teachers for teaching was declared one of the critical occupations crucial to the defense of the country by many of the local boards.

1942 Establishment of the Armed Forces Institute--offering high school and college correspondence courses.

1943 (Approximate.) Establishment of the Army specialized training program at colleges and universities.

1944 Surplus Property Act--beginning of development of a broad policy governing surplus property disposal for educational, health, and civil defense purposes.

1946 The George-Borden Act--strengthening federal-state cooperation in vocational education.

1946 Establishment of the "Regular" Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps--considered by some persons to be a full federal scholarship program.

1946 Atomic Energy Act--initiation of fellowship of offerings by the Atomic Energy Commission.

1946 Passage by Congress of a joint resolution approving U. S. membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

1948 Smith-Mundt Act--establishing a broad program of international educational exchanges.

1950 Enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874 providing federal support for schools in certain federally affected localities.

1950 Housing Act--origin of college housing loans program.

1952 Inauguration of the fellowship program of the National Science Foundation.

1954 Establishment of the Air Force Academy.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

1956 Organization of the Air Force Institute of Technology as a degree-granting institution.

1958 Educational and cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

1958 The National Defense Education Act--establishing new federal policies in education at all levels.

The entire history of federal education policies would be too voluminous to include here. Since a short list cannot include even a brief history of every one of the hundreds of federal educational activities, only those most indicative of the policies in this field will be discussed.

From the time of its inception the federal government has given funds, lands, and other resources to help the states and territories establish, conduct, and finance education. It began with federal land grants for common schools and colleges in states formed from the public domain.

From 1777 to 1958, a span of one hundred and eighty-one years, the United States educational policies and programs dealt with military training and facilities, land grants, and specialized vocational training, but few dealt directly with teacher education. Because education was considered the responsiblity of the state, teacher education, too, was felt to be in the realm of state direction.

It is interesting to note the attitudial changes as reflected in legislation and the number of bills passed before and after 1915. Interesting, too, is the impact some bills made which were far from the expectations of their authors. For instance, when President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act in 1862 authorizing the establishment of land-grant institutions, little did anyone realize the overwhelming repercussions it was to have on the education of the country, and ultimately, upon its destiny. It took a diminishing emphasis on agriculture and an expanding scientific

industry to open the doors of higher education to the common man. At last, an equal opportunity for education was possible.

LAND GRANT COLLEGES, MORRILL ACT, 1862

Beginning with an ordinance adopted in 1785 by the Congress of the Confederation for the disposal of public lands in the Western Territory, one section in every township was set aside for the endowment of schools within that township. Include the impact of the Ordinance of 1787 which made the now famous declaration of policy that "...religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged...," and it can be understood how support for federal aid began on a larger scale than ever before.

Support and encouragement for state universities were reflected in the national government's policy of donating public lands to the various states for the express purpose of starting institutions of higher education. Later it became a fixed procedure for federal authorities to hand over two townships of land to each state as it joined the Union. Ohio's Enabling Act ordering land grants for universities, created a model for other new states as they were admitted. A united group of businessmen, labor leaders, and farmers began demanding an expansion of land grant schools to better serve their needs as early as the 1850's and 1860's. They felt the technological needs were not being met in the liberal arts colleges.[8]

> The development of vocational education is as old as the history of man. Father-son and mother-daughter relationships have always passed on to the younger generation skills essential to survival. The European trade societies and guilds helped develop occupational preparation outside the home. Apprenticeship and indenture systems provided a means for youth to learn an occupation. Later lyceums and institutes provided formal preparation for work.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

> The United States developed the concept of education for all with alteration to the practical aspects of education. The Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the land grant systems, emphasized the agricultural and mechanic arts at the college level. Interest in providing similar opportunities for individuals below the college level fostered the development of manual training schools, trade education, and resident agriculture high schools in a number of states.[9]

Jonathan Baldwin Turner of Illinois developed the concept and was one of the first to lay out a plan for a state university which would be partially financed through a federal land grant. The legislature appealed to Congress for an endowment to realize this plan in 1853. The result was a bill introduced and moved through to legislation by Justin S. Morrill, a Congressman from Vermont, which asked for the land grant aid for agricultural and mechanical institutions. These two men were men of vision; they had anticipated educational needs. They created and caused political agitation long enough to make possible the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862.

The first Morrill Act granted, as a basis for a permanent endowment, 30,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative in Congress to each state, thus the name, "land-grant." This provided the impetus for at least one college in each state to teach the broad field of applied science: agriculture, home economics, forestry, engineering, business, mining, and all that pertains to each. The first Morrill Act was a milestone in the higher education movement. It greatly increased the number of state-controlled schools, and it changed the direction taken by university level instruction.[10]

PROGRAMS

The new agricultural and vocational programs had deplorably low and very flexible entrance requirements; even twelve-to-fourteen-year-old students were

admitted at Texas A and M as program administrators struggled to get initial studies under way. Most entrance requirements included proficiency in reading, writing, spelling, geography, arithmetic, and grammar. These were not very high standards for degree-granting institutions.

Engineering courses were one of two varieties. Either the student learned mastery of basic skills and procedures or he learned how to produce completed articles for sale and shop use.

Agriculture lectures at Cornell included "Principles of Agriculture," "Mechanic Arts," and "Hygiene." Liberal studies were included in both the engineering and agricultural studies. English composition, English literature, modern languages, political economy, constitutional history, and mathematics were included.

Soon the "Agricultural Practice" (practicum) courses were added to the major lectures and liberal studies. There were systematic field and barn observations and experimentation using special labs, a manual labor requirement, and physical exercise.

Women who enrolled as agriculture students took different courses. The "ladies courses" included the following: literature; history; general sciences, domestic economy, kitchen-dining room, and laundry work (to complete the labor requirement), horticulture, and light farm operations.

Experimental farms for research became one of the strongest assets of these agricultural programs. Crop rotation, introduction of new crops, combating pests, animal nutrition, and dairy bacteriology were all studied on experimental farms by these students.

From 1881-88, more scientific courses were added such as soil physics, plant physiology and pathology, as well as animal breeding and nutrition. National experimental stations were also established.[11]

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

NEED FOR MORE AND BETTER TEACHERS

Educational reform and extension were natural and inevitable phases of the general movement in the 1840's. Following the panic in 1837 (a somewhat milder depression than the one after the 1929 stock market crash), settled production, capitalistic control, and modern social class divisions began to appear.

There were increasing applications of science to the industries and a greater emphasis on vocational studies than ever before. The Industrial Movement included needs for canals, railroads, telegraphs, changing methods of cultivation, lands to be surveyed, roads to be constructed, as well as analyses of soils, fertilizers, feeds, and products.

Certain educational leaders had a broadened social vision. It was these leaders who demanded educational reform. They also recognized a great need for trained teachers.

At the college level, the professors taught in a classical and stilted manner much to the dismay of the students. Not only were the teaching methods unsuited to the subject matter, often the professors themselves were unsuitable. Texas A and M's chair of chemistry, natural science, and agriculture was held by a doctor of divinity. At Kansas Agricultural College, a minister was also hired; this man had no sympathies or understanding of applied science. The Professorship of Agriculture, Horticulture, and Greek was held by a masters of arts graduate at Florida State College.[12]

More qualified teachers were desperately needed not only at the college level, but also in elementary and secondary schools to better prepare the students. Most colleges had to teach secondary-level curriculum to entering students as the initial programs began. Teachers needed vocational training

themselves in order to teach these new, much-in-demand subjects to their students.

Because land-grant colleges met a need so well, they became popular and had growing enrollments. Teachers were needed to fill vacancies. As a result, it can be seen that even though teacher education was not an original part of the Morrill Act, it was an important amendment to it.

POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTES

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was founded in 1824 in Troy, New York. This all-male institution of higher learning was devoted to science and engineering. In 1850, the basic curriculum was changed from a one-year course in applied science to a three-year course in civil engineering. Today Rensselaer still flourishes; it now offers baccalaureate degrees in chemical, civil, electrical, metalurgical, mechanical and aeronautical engineering, and in physics, chemistry, biology, and architecture. Other degrees at higher levels are also offered. Rensselaer is but one of many polytechnic institutes which began to fill an unmet need and expanded to meet growing needs in the United States. These private institutes met the original need, and later, land-grant colleges opened state-owned doors to the many who could not afford the higher tuitions at private institutions. Higher education was no longer to be only for the elite.

Polytechnic Institutes played an important role both before the Morrill Act of 1862 and simultaneously with land-grant colleges to teach Black students. A second Morrill Act in 1890 created Negro schools in areas where restrictive admission policies governed state universities; it also provided direct funds to state-sponsored institutes of higher education.[13] The equal

opportunity for education was unprecedented; the spirit of progress that began in 1862 now continues to shape the world for the future.

Another famous institution, Tuskegee Institute, offered varied studies in agriculture. Here exhaustive experiments with peanut plants were carried out by George Washington Carver and his students. (He developed nearly 300 products from the various parts of this plant.) Black students could be assured an excellent education at this institution.

When the Morrill Acts were enacted, a nationwide explosion in the number of polytechnic institutions occurred, but they were state-operated. A few of the many institutions owing their origins to the Morrill Acts are the state universities of California, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

The number of land-grant institutions is currently seventy-two; the combined enrollment of these institutions is over 750,000. The Morrill Act had a great impact on American education indeed.[14]

THE GROWTH OF UNIVERSITIES

The era of the small college was over in the United States by 1900. Land-grant institutions, brought into being by the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, were beginning to offer programs in agriculture, applied sciences, and vocational preparation that were very different from the college curricula of an earlier time. Though smaller general-purpose schools continued to thrive, the opening of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 had ushered in an age of the university as a dominant institution. Because of Daniel Coit Galman's pioneering endeavor, a new kind of educational center had been initiated. Essentially, it was a blend of the German graduate school with the liberal

arts college, yet the end product resembled neither institution completely. Its primary purpose, as Abraham Flexner was later to remark, was scholarship and the production of new knowledge through research.[15] Harvard, Columbia, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, and other major institutions soon adopted its organizational structure and accepted the university's interests as their own. Before long, land-grant colleges were scrambling to emulate the university model.

Paralleling the explosive expansion of secondary schooling, student enrollments in universities' undergraduate schools, not to mention their graduate divisions, mounted steadily. Around the focal liberal arts program with its traditional concerns for general education, each university developed a cluster of graduate professional schools specializing in business, dentistry, nursing, education, engineering, social work, law, and agriculture. From the very beginning, this combination created a certain tension or confusion of purpose. Was it true, as university founders boldly proclaimed in the 1880's that their institutions existed primarily to advance the bounds of human understanding, to produce scholars, to sustain the life of the mind? Or was it to train tomorrow's "nonacademic" leaders to discharge their respective functions in the practical world of politics, business, and industry? Throughout the Twentieth Century, questions such as these have kept higher education in a complete state of turmoil.[16]

Although the primary task of the original land-grant institution had been to put undergraduate education within the reach of nearly all citizens, the past decades have been witness to the astounding progress made in the development of science at these institutions. The graduates of land-grant schools have contributed immensely to the social and economic welfare of the

nation in everything from the soybean to the carburetor. Very few fields have remained untouched by the products of these institutions. These same products are the answers to higher education's dilemma.

TRANSITION

To most state legislators and governors, federal monies for education are a mixed blessing. Although they helped raise the capabilities and quality of state institutions, these same monies also put pressure on the state governments to increase their higher education appropriations if for no other reason than to fullfill the matching requirement of many federal awards. But even funds which were not channeled through the state agencies and did not require the state to provide matching funds gave some impetus to increased appropriations for higher education. Of course, many felt the federal role in higher education was growing too rapidly.

> Although few issues aroused so much ire as the question of federal-state relations in education, more education bills were passed. The Twentieth Century brought a partial reversal of public opinion. The *Smith-Hughes Act* of 1917 financing vocational education in the high schools won acceptance, as did its expansion in the *George-Reed Act* of 1929 and the *George-Dean Act* of 1936. The *Smith-Lever Act* of 1914 creating Agricultural Extension Service met no effective resistance, even though it placed the national government in the role of sponsor for educational programs in home economics, farming, and related fields. The same effect was brought about by passage of the *Vocational Rehabilitation Act* of 1920 and the *Social Security Act* of 1935. The government was allocating funds for vocational programs to rehabilitate the physically handicapped.[17]

After World War II, the G.I. Bill (*Servicemen's Readjustment Act* of 1944) was one of many legislative acts channeling federal funds into education--billions of dollars in all.

On October 27, 1943, the President sent this message to the members of Congress:

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 13, 1942, on signing the bill calling for the induction by selective service of young men 18 and 19 years old, I appointed a committee of educators, under the problem of education of our service men and women after the war. The objective was to enable those young people whose education had been interrupted, to resume their schooling and to provide an opportunity for the education and technical training of the other young men and women of ability after their discharge from the armed services.

This committee has sent me a preliminary report which I am herewith transmitting to the Congress for its consideration, and, I hope, for its early action.

We, at home, owe a special and continuing obligation to these men and women in the armed services.

During the war we have seen to it that they have received the best training and equipment, the best food, shelter, and medical attention, the best protection and care which planning, ingenuity, physical resources, and money could furnish. But after the war shall have been won, the best way that we can repay a portion of that debt is to see to it, by planning and by action now, that those men and women are demobilized into an economy which is sound and prosperous, with a minimum of unemployment and dislocation; and that, with the assistance of Government, they are given the opportunity to find a job for which they are fitted and trained, in a field which offers some reasonable assurance of well-being and continuous employment.

For many, what they desire most in the way of employment will require special training and further education. As a part of a general program for the benefit of our armed services, I believe that the Nation is morally obligated to provide this training and education and the necessary financial assistance by which they can be secured. It is an obligation which should be recognized now; and legislation to that end should be enacted as soon as possible.

...Nothing will be more conducive to the maintenance of high morale in our troops than the knowledge that steps are being taken now to give them education and training when the fighting is over.

Vocational and educational opportunities for veterans should be of the widest range. There will be those of limited education who now appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the importance of general education and who would welcome a year in school or college. There will be those who desire to learn a remunerative trade or to fit themselves more adequately for specialized work in agriculture or commerce. There will be others who want professional courses to prepare them for their lifework.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Lack of money should not prevent any veteran of this war from equipping himself for the most useful employment for which his aptitudes and willingness qualify him. The money invested in this training and schooling program will reap rich dividends in higher productivity, more intelligent leadership, and greater human happiness.

We must replenish our supply of persons qualified to discharge heavy responsibilities of the post-war world. We have taught our youth how to wage war; we must also teach them how to live useful and happy lives in freedom, justice, and decency.

Specifically, I agree with the recommendations made by the Committee in this regard as follows:

1. The Federal Government should have it financially feasible for every man and woman who has served honorably for a minimum period in the armed forces since September 16, 1940, to spend a period up to one calendar year, in a school, a college, a technical institution, or in actual training in industry, so that he can further his education, learn a trade, or acquire the necessary knowledge and skill for farming, commerce, manufacturing, or other pursuits.

2. In addition, the Federal Government should make it financially possible for a limited number of ex-servicemen and women selected for their special aptitudes to carry on their general, technical, or professional education for a further period of one, two, or three years.

This assistance from Government should include not only the cost of instruction but a certain amount of money for maintenance.

...And I might call to your attention the fact that it costs less per year to keep a man at school, or college, or training on the job than to maintain him on active military duty for a year.

...In addition, the United States Armed Forces Institute, which is a joint operation of the Army and Navy, offers men and women in the armed services a chance to enroll in courses usually offered by colleges, high schools, technical and occupational schools in which they can study in their off-duty time. The Institute prepares self-teaching textbooks which enable them to learn a subject entirely on their own initiative; or, if they prefer, they may join any one of hundreds of classes which have or are being established in Army camps and posts and in Navy installations, and in Army and Navy hospitals, here in the United States, and in places all over the world. Or, if they wish, they can study by the correspondence method with the Institute or with one of its overseas branches the same as any student in a correspondence school.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

> ...Therefore, if the Congress adopts the general objective outlined herein, our men and women in the armed forces will be afforded opportunities for continuance of their education and vocational training--first, during the war; second, during the demobilization period; and, third, for a year or more after their separation from the service.
>
> While the successful conclusion of this great war is by no means within our sight, yet it may well be said that the time to prepare for peace is at the height of war.
>
> Franklin D. Roosevelt[18]

Roosevelt's letter outlined, in general, the terms of the bill which was to affect over 1,000,000 veterans. The G. I. Bill itself spelled out these suggestions in concrete terms.

Teacher education felt the impact of this bill, too, for hundreds of thousands of veterans studied to become teachers. This marked the start of a period in which the teacher shortage would become a problem of the past.

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The idea of a federal agency designed primarily to promote education and the progress of science and organized along the lines of large private foundations was born before World War II had ended. Congress finally established the National Science Foundation (NSF) in May, 1950, recognizing the need for a federal agency responsible for advancing all branches of American science and organized so as to be sensitive to the views of the scientific community.

The statute creating the NSF authorizes and directs it to support basic research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential, to award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences, and to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists. At first the foundation pursued these objectives mainly by (1) providing support for basic

research in the form of project grants given on the basis of scientific merit for highest quality work of individuals or small groups of scientists at universities; and (2) awarding graduate and post-doctoral fellowships in the sciences.

Fiscal year 1952, the first year in which funds were available, ninety-six project research grants were made to fifty-nine institutions in thirty-three states and the District of Columbia. Fifteen years later, in fiscal year 1967, 3,972 project research grants amounting to $172 million were made to over 400 institutions in forty-nine states and the District of Columbia.[19] Early research was limitd to the engineering fields. Later, in 1965, mathematical and physical sciences research were added. In 1966, the biological and social sciences rounded out the research areas.

In 1956, some important advances were made by NSF in support of research. For the first time, NSF provided monies for procurement of science facilities. For example, both the National Radio Astronomy Observatory at Green Bank, West Virginia, and the Kitt Peak National Observatory in Arizona, were begun in 1956. These observatories are now operated for NSF by associations of universities.[20]

Then in fiscal year 1964, the National Science Foundation started its graduate traineeship program. By fiscal year 1957, 8,719 fellowships and traineeships were awarded.[21]

NSF IMPACT ON TEACHER EDUCATION

In the area of in-service education for teachers, NSF, in fiscal year 1953, sponsored its first experimental summer institutes for college science

teachers. In the following summer, this experimental program was expanded. These summer training sessions have become operational programs and have been further augmented by in-service training of teachers at evening classes. Since the inception of these programs, about 300,000 training opportunities for science teachers have been provided by NSF.[22]

In addition, new courses and curriculum for many subjects were developed by bringing scholars of a discipline together with teachers of science in the public school systems. Original efforts of this sort were directed primarily at pre-college education where the need was the greatest. More recent programs of support for undergraduate education have, in large part, been similar in nature.

Grants of matching funds have enabled smaller colleges to purchase needed laboratory equipment. In addition, the institutional grant, an annual award of funds which may be used for the institution receiving it for any purpose which directly supports academic science, is given.

In all of these programs, the aim of the National Science Foundation is to provide institutions with the means to carry out their own plans for development and to adapt to their changing needs.

SUMMARY

In 1777, while still an infant nation, there was federal legislation which impacted upon education. At that time, there were but a few individuals interested in supporting education bills. This legislation, like all federal legislation dealing with education, was not specifically called for in the United States Constitution, but rather, was inferred as essential by Article I.

INITIAL FEDERAL INTERVENTION

The total number of bills from 1777-1978 impacting upon education would fill volumes, however a partial listing of legislation from 1777-1978 reflects the educational concerns of the legislators of those same years.

Certain legislation has had the greatest impact upon teacher education. For example, the *Morrill Act of 1862* (Land-Grant Colleges), the *Morrill Act of 1890* (Creation of Negro Colleges), the G. I. Bill, and the National Science Foundation legislation all have played important roles in higher education/teacher education. Sometimes the legislation did not directly state aid for teacher education; still the impact made was the same--quality teachers were needed for quality education.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Michael Timpane, "Federal Education Programs and Their Effect on Teacher Education,"AACTE 1977 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977).

[2]Peter Schrag, "End of the Impossible Dream," Saturday Review (September 19, 1970), p. 68.

[3]Christopher J. Lucas, Our Western Educational Heritage (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), p. 469.

[4]Ibid., p. 470.

[5]Ibid., p. 500.

[6]Ibid., p. 508.

[7]Charles A. Quattlebaum, Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals A Survey and Handbook (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969). pp. 15-16.

[8]Lucas, op.cit., p. 523.

[9]Robert E. Taylor and Aaron J. Miller, "Vocational Education," The Teachers Handbook (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1971), pp. 349-353.

[10]Lucas, op.cit., pp. 506-507.

[11]Earle Dudley Ross, American Education Its Men, Ideas, and Institutions or Democracy's College The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative State (New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1942, 1969) p. 12.

[12]Ibid., pp. 21-26.

[13]Lucas, op.cit., p. 507.

[14]"Rensselaer Instititue," Funk and Wagnalls Standard Reference Encyclopedia (1961 ed.) XX, 7522.

[15]Abraham Flexner, Universities: American, English, German (New York: Oxford University Press, n.d.) p. 523.

[16]Lucas, op.cit., p. 523.

[17]Ibid., op.cit., p. 525.

[18]Franklin D. Roosevelt, Message to Congress (Washington, D.C.: H. Doc. No. 344, 78th Congress, 1st Session, n.d.).

[19]Quattlebaum, op.cit., p. 62.

[20]Ibid., p. 63.

[21]Ibid., p. 64.

[22]Ibid., p. 65.

REFERENCES

Arthur E. Bestor, Educational Wastelands (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1953).

Merle L. Borrowman, ed. Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965).

Merle L. Borrowman, ed. The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education: A Historian Survey of American Thought (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956).

James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963).

G.K. Hodenfield and T.M. Stinnett, The Education of Teachers: Conflict and Consensus (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961).

James D. Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963).

Edward T. Ladd, Sources of Tension in School-University Collaboration (Atlanta: Urban Laboratory in Education, 1969).

National Institute of Education, 1976 Databook: The Status of Education Research and Development in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976).

Jessie M. Pangburn, The Evolution of the American Teachers College (New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932).

Elmer R. Smith, Teacher Education: A Reappraisal (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).

Othanel Smith, Teachers for the Real World (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969).

Senator Thomas, "Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1944," Senate Report No. 687 (Washington, D.C.: 78th Congress, 2nd Session, 1944).

Virginia Y. Trotter, "Federal Role in Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, (Summer, 1975).

Chapter 3

3

REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

There was no teaching profession when schools were first established in America. Historically, teachers were usually itinerant, and the majority were low-paid males with little formal education. Many were of dubious worth and character. Later, citizens concerned over the welfare of their children set up "visiting committees" of educated persons to visit the schools in order to determine the teachers' competency and insure adequate learning. Despite these visiting committees, many marginal persons served in the absence of qualified teachers.

Not until the 1830's and 40's was America introduced to the European concept of normal schools for teacher education. At first, normal school students had less than a high school education; later, a high school education became a common requirement. Normal school curricula offered some subject matter and a smattering of pedagogy. Since the students were predominately female, elementary teaching primarily became a women's profession.

In drafting the Constitution, the Founding Fathers rejected the idea of a

national system of education. Instead, they left to each state the responsibility for providing educational opportunity for its people. However, under the Constitution's General Welfare clause, the federal government has the right to take action when the general welfare of all U.S. citizens is involved. Furthermore, the Bill of Rights allows the federal courts to intervene in matters where the rights of individuals are abridged.

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

Not until nearly one hundred years after the founding of the nation did the federal government enter directly into educational affairs when it established the Department of Education in Washington in 1867. This legislation was deliberately circumspect concerning state powers because the Department was restricted to collecting and disseminating only nationwide data on education. The purpose of the activity was to "aid the people...in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the Country."[1]

For almost the next ninety years, until the 1960's, the federal government had practically no policymaking role in elementary and secondary education in the United States. The U.S. Office of Education collected statistics; a few hundred districts received payments to offset the financial impact of nearby federal installations; and very small amounts of money were distributed to the states to further vocational education. But in the year-to-year development of local school policies, the federal government had no role.

The reasons why the federal government had no role were constitutional. The Constitution is silent on the topic of education--which was not even a

public function at the time of adoption. Later in the Nineteenth Century, when public elementary and secondary education began to develop, local government (joined gradually by the states) set all educational policy; the federal government showed little interest in playing a part.[2]

In the late Nineteenth Century and into the Twentieth, normal schools lengthened their periods of preparation to two years. Later, impelled by the growing need for secondary teachers and by the desire of the society to expand higher education opportunities close to home, many became teachers' colleges and then state universities. Teacher education became a significant element in the majority of both public and private colleges and universities. Unfortunately, teaching did not develop a professional preparation program with characteristics similar to other professions.

During the 1920's and 1930's, neither the public, the teaching profession, nor the universities had thought of teaching as a professional act demanding knowledge, certain behavior characteristics, and skills parallel to other developing professions.

This lack of professionalization in teacher education continued with little change through the early years of the Twentieth Century and even into the post-World War II period. There was also very little support to underwrite a federal role in public school education. With the exception of legislation providing benefits for veterans, the Morrill Act and the Smith-Hughes Act for Vocational Education, participation in the educational process by the federal government remained largely at the information-gathering and dissemination level until after the Second World War.

Between World War II and 1957, proponents of federal involvement in education had been thwarted by three obstacles: localism and resistance of

federal control of educational policymaking; divided opinion (political and Constitutional) on aid to private, often church-related schools; and Southern resistance to school desegregation requirements in postwar federal aid proposals.[3]

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

The launching of the Russian Sputnik in 1957 not only declared the U.S.S.R.'s supremacy in the race for the conquest of space, but it also set up a chain reaction which resulted in a demand for better science education programs in the public schools of the United States.

Sputnik awakened the nation to presumed deficiencies in the schools which resulted in the federal government responding with large-scale efforts to stimulate improved teaching. Because the government assumed that the problem was teachers' subject matter deficiency, it poured resources into curriculum development and academic in-service education, mainly in the sciences and mathematics. Obviously, there was significant upgrading in these subject matter areas; however, pedagogy, the professional act of teaching, received scant attention.

After the Russians launched Sputnik, deep concern developed over (1) the quality of education in the nation's schools, (2) the impact on American leadership in science and technology, and (3) long-term national security. Acting under the broad terms of the Constitution's General Welfare clause, Congress moved quickly to establish the National Defense Education Act. Also, the National Science Foundation Act funded thousands of workshops to upgrade the performance of science and mathematics teachers. In 1965, Congress passed both the Higher Education and Elementary and Secondary Education Acts

funneling massive amounts of resources into colleges and urban school systems. In the late sixties, the government attempted to improve the quality of teacher education and instituted a number of programs through the 1967 Education Professions Development Act (EPDA). By the mid-seventies, however, federal funding for teacher education had significantly declined. Whether this decline has been due to deteriorating economic conditions, the alleged surplus of teachers, or to other causes is uncertain.

There are four major and representative pieces of legislation in which the federal government became specifically involved in the training and retraining of teachers and other educational personnel. Each of these four pieces of legislation has appeared in the past twenty years, yet information on how one piece of legislation either resulted from previous legislation, or helped to modify successive legislation, has never been adequately documented.

The four pieces of legislation are as follows: the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and its subsequent amendments; the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its amendments; the Higher Education Act of 1965 and its amendments; and finally, the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, an extensive amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The passage of the Education Professions Development Act was by far the most far-reaching and all-inclusive of these acts and the one which most seriously addressed itself to the task of training and retraining educational personnel. According to Public Law 90-35, the purpose of this Act was

> ...to coordinate, broaden, and strenghthen programs for the training and improvement of the qualifications of teachers and other educational personnel for all levels of the American educational system to provide a better foundation for meeting the critical needs of the Nation for personnel in these areas.[4]

It is appropriate that a quick review be given here of the major

breakthroughs wrought by these pieces of legislation. This federal legislation reflects the Nation's reaction, to the rapid technological and sociological changes which followed World War II.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

From the beginning, the programs begun at the National Science Foundation(NSF) were research-oriented. In the same way that applied research was at the core of the experimental field stations of the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service, basic research was at the core of NSF activities. In both cases, each agency was subjected to substantial pressures to move it away from its original focus. Early on, the NSF programs established a reputation for supporting activities at only a select group of colleges and universities because the Foundation's emphasis was on research in the subject matter disciplines and because only a limited number of institutions had the facilities to carry out advanced research. This "elitist" trend was modified in recent years because the Foundation made conscious efforts to broaden its support to include poorer institutions.

Teacher training was not an early priority of NSF. Teacher training usually took second place when NSF officials had to make a choice between research and teacher training as a priority. Nonetheless, NSF always recognized that teacher training was a major area for study. This concern was expressed first by the establishment of training programs for college teachers which were soon bypassed in size and number by similar programs for the training and retraining of science and mathematics teachers at the secondary level. In the first years of National Science Foundation operation, only a small amount of its funds were devoted to such purposes; but after the Russian

space achievements in the late fifties, NSF's entire budget increased substantially with sizable amounts of funds appropriated for teacher training. In 1958-59, about $30 million was set aside for the training of secondary school teachers and about $2.4 million for college teachers. This amount and ratio of the distribution of funds continued almost unchanged through the 1960's, so that by 1970, $33 million and $4.5 million were being spent respectively on such programs.[5]

One fact was unmistakably clear at the outset: the quality of teaching in the sciences and mathematics at the secondary level was even lower than had been anticipated. It was understood that when resources became available, some way had to be found to change this pattern of performance if the over-all quality of teaching in science and mathematics was to be upgraded.

Creation of Teacher Institutes

The solution adopted by NSF officials was one which proved to be a major innovative breakthrough in American education: the creation of "institutes" to transfer knowledge from major research centers to classroom practitioners. These institutes proved to be infinitely adaptable by a variety of institutions for a wide range of purposes.

Begun first as short-term summer institutes, they were later expanded to academic-year institutes and in-service institutes. The presence of a handful of generally superior faculty and a limited number of teachers was required. They were all brought together for a certain length of time to learn a specific amount of subject-matter information. However, little consideration was given to the pedagogical problems of teachers.

The establishment of summer institutes was a fortuitous decision. Not only were teachers free over the summer months, but senior professors as well

as university facilities were also free. In addition, scheduling conflicts were minimal. Teachers and professors were given a chance to increase their incomes (stipends and salaries were provided respectively), and at the same time teachers were enabled to advance professionally. The fact that these institutes were held during the summer meant that badly needed teachers did not have to be absent from their classrooms during the academic year.

It was well that the NSF decided not to make its teacher training and retraining efforts into full-year fellowship programs. Such programs would then have had to be absorbed into the traditional academic structure of the university (i.e., regular courses, prerequisites, degree requirements), and students would not have been able to follow courses of study specifically designed to make them better-qualified teachers.

Academic-Year Institutes

This idea of designing courses specifically for the special needs of groups of teachers was later expanded into academic-year institutes, and in a more modified way, into in-service institutes as well. In-service institutes are generally looked upon as the least expensive type to design and mount but are also considered by many the least useful type of institute because of the limited and fragmented amount of time a teacher is exposed to them. However, in-service institutes did provide linkage between the problems of the classroom and the vast changes that were then taking place in course content such as "new math." Many teachers never trained in "new math" were required to teach it. In their cases, in-service institutes helped them implement new course material.

The academic-year institutes were a much more significant development. Because Congress recognized them as an effective way of improving the quality

of teachers throughout the country, these academic-year institutes received substantial Congressional appropriations. Congress periodically expressed willingness to provide NSF with more funds if only NSF would give greater priority to implementing the academic-year institutes on a systematically broader scale. Foundation officials were willing to do this but not at the expense of their more research-oriented programs.

In retrospect, the teacher training programs of NSF were more popular with the Congress than they were with the National Science Foundation. Because of this Congressional popularity, these and other institutes received sufficient funds to expand nationwide.

Another development was the establishment for the first time of "sequential" institutes. A sequential institute was one that continued over several summers for the same group of individuals and which usually ended with a master's degree. The earlier summer institutes were merely courses repeated summer after summer for different groups of teachers. Although sequential institutes did not initially benefit from multi-year funding, such funding practices were soon adopted by NSF for both of these programs and other programs as well.

What the institute also achieved was an alternative approach to the training and retraining of teachers. To the extent that these teachers were secondary school teachers, the institutes also effectively brought the urgent and special needs of high school level teachers to the attention of the colleges and universities.

In the beginning, the institutes were looked upon as experimental programs. Unlike many other federal pilot projects, the NSF institutes were implemented on a national basis. Many institutions of higher learning

recognized the process. Yet other universities did not absorb the institutes into their systems as part of the curriculum. As a result, the institutes were not "institutionalized." Perhaps the threatened loss of federal funds prevented the universities from absorbing the institutes into the structure, perhaps not. In any case, the range of institutes developed by NSF proved to be a breakthrough in the federal government's assistance in the training and retraining of teachers.[6]

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed in 1958. Although NDEA programs were not of major concern to renovating teacher training, an understanding of their development is essential to an understanding of many of the legislative actions which were to affect higher education activities later. The opening paragraph of this act refers to "security", "emergency", and "defense." It was in the environment suggested by such language that the NDEA came into being. The Act was the cumulative product of dozens of bills introduced in Congress that year which dealt directly or indirectly with education, and it reflected the 85th Congress' anxiety about Russia's and the educational system which made the feat possible.

Although largely a reaction to the uproar created by , the NDEA was also an effort by Congress to fight what it considered "progressive" education. This movement, it was argued, was responsible for the failure of "about one-half of our bright students in the Nation" to attend college. The "drop-out" had been officially discovered. Besides providing funds to help keep students in school, Congress proposed to beef up the opportunities for young men and women to study the "hard subjects" by updating classroom

teachers in summer institutes.

Teacher Education

At the same time, Congress proposed to take care of the shortage of teachers, another "discovery." As a result, a four-year, billion dollar program was proposed (although only about $115 million was appropriated the first year) to improve the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages at all levels.[7] Neither those who wrote the legislation nor its administrators knew that they were about to bring to the educational enterprise a new recognition of the possibility and need to "interconnect" programs, but that was the consequence of their labor.

There was universal consensus that the quality of teaching should be upgraded, particularly at the higher levels. Many people also agreed that there was a shortage of teachers. Others thought the shortage was overstated and that an oversupply was actually possible if doctorates for college teachers were produced at the rate anticipated by the NDEA legislation. In its peak years, the NDEA was providing 6,000 new fellowships a year at an estimated cost per year of about $80 million. Between 1959 and 1969, about 27,000 fellowships were awarded at an estimated cost of $350 million.[8]

Regardless of both foresight and hindsight, NDEA represents another major federal effort in support of elementary and secondary education and, more particularly, higher education. Through this legislation, Congress deliberately attempted to correct the imbalance created in the nation's graduate training centers by the earlier selective support of science and engineering. The NDEA corrected this imbalance by providing graduate support for doctoral study in disciplines, with special emphasis on the humanities and social sciences.

REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Title IV of NDEA came to be known as the NDEA Fellowship Program. In addition, both Title V and Title VI of the Act imitated the National Science Foundation by authorizing the establishment of short-term and regular-session institutes for teachers engaged in counseling and guidance in the secondary schools, and the creation of centers, short-term and regular session institutes at institutions of higher learning for training in foreign languages, and in such related fields as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology.[9]

Stimulation of New Program Development

Like the NSF programs, the NDEA programs were categorical. Congress specified the number of fellowships, the subject-matter areas, and the kinds of institutions eligible for support. Congress also chose to adhere to previous legislation by restricting the distribution of funds to "new and expanded programs" at institutions of higher learning.

Grants, in other words, went to institutions and not to individuals. Individuals applied to these institutions and not to the Office of Education. This procedure had the advantage of by-passing the bureaucracy of the Office of Education. It also by-passed any temptation the federal government might have to intervene by asserting any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel on any education institution or school system.

The NDEA fellowships were research-oriented but only to the extent that this research was coupled to doctoral programs specifically designed to provide more teachers for universities and colleges. A significant departure in the NDEA legislation was the clear intent of the Congress to concentrate NDEA programs in small and medium-sized institutions thus reversing the

elitist trend in NSF to concentrate on universities with established reputations.

A major curiosity of the NDEA legislation was the reference in it to the actual "teaching" requirements for those who, through NDEA fellowships, were being trained for the teaching profession. No serious concern was expressed that potential teachers actually be provided with teaching experiences while being trained. Nor did the legislation require of fellows to actually teach upon completion of their training. They needed only "...to be available for teaching service."[10]

SOCIOLOGICAL CHANGES AND DEVELOPMENT

The context of teacher education as well as of education itself has been significantly changed by recent major sociological trends in American society. These trends have changed the expectations for education, and therefore, the demands upon teachers. Teachers must be equipped to perform a different and broader set of responsibilities than was formerly required of them.

Population Shifts

There has been a significant shift in the distribution of the American population. As recently as the beginning of this century, the great majority of Americans lived in small towns or rural settings. Education was a small-scale activity in which teachers worked closely with the parents of the children in their charge. This pattern changed rapidly. By the mid-Twentieth Century, most Americans lived either in an urban or suburban environment. The suburbs in particular had developed explosively in the years following World War II. The proportion of Americans who still lived the stereotypical life on

farms and in small towns diminished rapidly.

Since the 1960's, still another trend has been under way. The nation's large cities are losing population. With rare exceptions limited to the cities in the sunbelt, large cities now contain fewer citizens overall and many fewer school children than was the case even twenty years ago. Between 1970 and 1975, there was a net loss of seven million persons five years of age and over from the nation's central cities.[11] Furthermore, the population balance is no longer shifting to the suburbs. While there is still some overall suburban growth, many suburbs now have stablized in population and even began to decline in population as they aged into minor replicas of the cities which spawned them.

The most recent shifts in American population are toward small towns and rural areas. During the period 1970-1975, there was a net emigration of 1.6 million persons from metropolitan areas in the United States.[12] Rural states, both North and South, which have had heavy emigration for decades, have become the largest gainers in population during the 1970's at the expense of the major industrial states.[13]

These population shifts among rural, urban, and suburban communities are also related to major population shifts which have occurred and are still occurring between the South and North, involving white populations as well as Black and other minority populations. Early in this century, the overwhelming majority of Black Americans lived in the states of the former Confederacy where their ancestors had once been slaves. With the development of the great industrial centers of the North, millions of Black people moved North seeking greater economic opportunities. The schools of the major cities of the North had been filled with the children of recent European immigrants. As those

immigrants climbed the ladder of economic success and moved to the suburbs, they were succeeded by Black immigrants from the American South, thus the enrollment of big-city school systems became increasingly Black.

In all but a few major cities, children of minority groups, especially Blacks, now make up over half of the school enrollment.[14] The proportion of Black children in the big city school population continues to increase while most cities remain surrounded by suburbs which are almost exclusively white. This enormous mass migration of Blacks to the cities of the North has ceased, and for the first time since Emancipation the number of Blacks moving back into the Southern States is beginning to balance those who are leaving.[15] Overall, there was a net migration of nearly two million persons to the South from 1970 to 1975, more than double the migration to the West.[16]

The pattern of Black and white migration is being repeated in the pattern of settlement and migration by the United States' newest large minority group, Spanish-speaking Americans. Spanish-speaking Americans of Mexican origin had long resided in the Southwestern United States. However, the number of Chicano has recently been greatly increased both by natural reproduction and by an influx of illegal aliens. Furthermore, they have begun to move in large numbers from the Southwest into other areas of the United States. In addition to Chicanos, there is a continuing large migration of United States citizens from Puerto Rico to the mainland. These Hispanic persons are following the historic pattern established by other majority groups in seeking economic advancement in the large industrial cities. Spanish-speaking communities, barrios, in Chicago and other cities have grown rapidly with migrants from the Southwest. New York City as well as other Eastern cities have rapidly increasing populations of Spanish-Americans of Puerto Rican origin. There

were more than eleven million persons in the U.S. in 1975 of Spanish origin.[17] About twenty percent of Hispanic-surnamed families have incomes below the poverty level.[18]

This rapid increase in the Spanish-speaking minority populations poses a particular challenge to education because it introduces the issue of language differences of earlier European immigrant groups. Also, Black children speak English, albeit often nonstandard English. In contrast, however, many of these Chicano children come from homes in which Spanish is spoken at home, and their lack of fluency in English prevents them from benefiting fully from a normal instructional program conducted in English. Spanish-speaking student populations also introduce cultural differences with which most teachers are not familiar and to which they often do not respond effectively. This rapid increase in the Spanish-American population continues, and Spanish-Americans now make up significant percentages of the school population in many American cities: eleven percent in Chicago, twenty-four percent in Los Angeles, twenty-three percent in Denver, twenty-seven percent in New York, sixteen percent in Houston, and twenty-five percent in Dade County, Florida.[19]

Family Structure Changes

There have also been significant shifts in the American family structure during this century. The traditional American family model has been the two-parent family in which the father earns the living for the family and the mother remains at home to rear the children. To be sure, this idealized model has not always been followed in practice. There have always been children raised in single-parent homes or in homes in which both parent were employed. However, the model of the ideal family is deeply entrenched in American belief, and any deviation from the model is usually assumed to be

inferior.

In the last half-century, nearly every aspect of the two-parent family model has come under stress. While it is still true that the majority of American children are raised in two-parent families, that proportion is declining rather rapidly. Divorce or separation are far more common than before. Consequently, many more children are raised by only one parent or by one parent and a step-parent rather than by the child's natural parents. During the brief period 1967-1973, the proportion of white children under age eighteen living with both parents declined from about ninety-two percent to eighty-nine percent. For Black children, the decline was greater, from sixty-eight percent in 1967 to fifty-six percent in 1973.[20] Between 1963 and 1972, the number of children annually involved in divorce and annulments nearly doubled, exceeding one million in 1972.[21]

Even when the child has two parents living at home, it is likely that the mother as well as the father works. A majority of the mothers of school-age children are now employed. The percentage of working mothers of school-age children doubled from twenty-six percent in 1948 to fifty-two percent in 1975. One-third of the mothers of children under age three were employed in 1975.[22]

Furthermore, there is a rapid increase in the number of unwed mothers with infants. Until recently, if a girl became pregnant before marriage, it was customary that either a forced marriage was arranged or the child was given up for adoption. It has now become far more acceptable for unmarried mothers to keep and raise their own children without the devastating social stigma which used to be present in such situations. It has even become possible for single individuals to adopt children. Because of the rapid

changes in traditional family structure, today's children are under a great deal of stress. Teachers must be prepared to accept and understand the problems many children experience as a result of these changes.

The changing role of the American family and the influences upon it are symptomatic of other changes in American society. The influence of religion in American life has substantially declined during this century. Although an overwhelming majority of Americans profess a belief in God and a majority attend church, religion is less important as a determinant of personal conduct and less often invoked as a standard for society. Children are less likely to come to school with a clear set of religious or moral values developed at home. They live and grow up in an atmosphere of moral ambiguity shaped by powerful influences beyond their control. Inevitably, much of the responsibility for teaching moral values has been transferred from the home to the schools. In the 1976 Gallup Poll of Attitudes Toward Education, sixty-seven percent of the national sample agreed that the schools should share responsibility for the moral development of children.[23]

Recognition of Educational Needs

Language Deficiencies

These sweeping changes in American society have produced a new context for education which call for teachers who can perform effectively in meeting the diverse needs of a changing student population. One of these is the need to respond appropriately to cultural differences among school children. Until recently, it was simply taken for granted that a major function of education was to mold all American children into the model of the white middle class from which most teachers have come and from which they continue to be drawn. Although the public school population contains an increasing proportion of

Black and other minority students, eighty-nine percent of elementary/secondary teachers and eighty-nine percent of teacher education students are white. Only one percent of teachers and two percent of teacher education students are of Hispanic origin.[24]

Expressions of cultural values which did not fit the middle class model typically were ignored or suppressed by the schools. Children with other language backgrounds were forbidden to speak their native language in school and in some cases were punished if they did so. Different cultural traditions held by ethnic and minority groups were ignored or deprecated by the schools. The melting pot approach held full sway.

This condition has now substantially changed. Children who come to school with other language backgrounds may be offered bilingual education. There has been substantial expansion of the federal Bilingual Education Program, not only for Spanish-speaking children but for American Indian, Portuguese, Chinese, and many other languages spoken by various minority groups in the United States as well. Furthermore, cultural differences among children are now valued and encouraged. Many schools now celebrate Black History Week as well as recognize the contributions of other racial and ethnic groups. Deliberate efforts are made to include works by authors from many cultural traditions in literature courses and to present a more sympathetic view of cultural diversity in social studies programs. A teacher who has grown up in the English-speaking middle class as most teachers have, faces a severe test of his or her professionalism in this new context.

Urban/Rural Education

There is also a growing recognition of the unique needs of urban and rural education. Urban and rural education are different in some important

ways in the experiences which they bring to school when they enter and which continue to shape their development through their school years. There has been talk of "urban survival skills" as a curriculum need for urban schools, but there is also an equal need for teaching rural children how to survive in their own particular environment. Furthermore, because of the mobility of the American population, students must be educated to cope not only in the narrow environment in which they live but in many other types of environments in which they may find themselves later in their lives. Part of the task of contemporary education is to help students move from whatever restricted backgrounds are reflected in a particular classroom to a broader view of the total American society which can maximize their future opportunities.

Economically Disadvantaged

Poverty and economic deprivation have always been present in American society but the impact which they have had upon education has usually been ignored. The Twentieth Century brought greater recognition of the devastating effects of family poverty upon the educational performance and aspirations of children. While there has been a substantial national effort, partly successful, to raise families above the threshold of basic needs, poverty remains widespread in the United States. Consequently, the children in American public schools come disproportionately from families in poverty. The cycle of poverty repeats itself as one generation's circumstances of poverty inhibit the aspirations, motivations, and opportunities of the next generation. There is the recognition of a developing American underclass which is, for the most part, excluded from participation in the mainstream of American society. This underclass subsists at the barest level of survival with almost no hope for improvement in their lives.

REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Family poverty has many educational consequences. Children from poor families are more likely to be undernourished and thereby prone to illness resulting in chronic absenteeism. They are less likely to have resources such as books and adequate places for study available to them at home. Perhaps most important, they are less likely to have parents who value education, who will encourage their children's educational aspirations, and who are able to assist their children's education. As a result, children from poor families are much more likely to drop out of school before high school graduation and much less likely to continue in higher education. The incidence of poverty is four times greater among Black families than among white families.[25] Black students are also more likely to drop out of high school before graduation.[26] Among high-ability level, high socio-economic status (SES) high school graduates, there is little difference between Black and white students in their rates of participation in subsequent post-secondary education. At any level of ability, higher SES high school graduates are much more likely to continue into post-secondary education. For low and middle SES students, Black students are even more likely than white students of equivalent ability to enter post-secondary education.[27] However, proportionately fewer Blacks than whites fall into higher SES levels or are categorized as high-ability by the measures used. It is encouraging, however, that overall college participation rates of Blacks have been increasing in recent years and now approach the rates for whites.[28]

Segregation

There are other categories of educational needs which have emerged more recently. Until the *Brown* decision in 1954, nearly all children in the United States were educated with children of their own race.[29] Segregation was

mandatory (de jure) in Southern states and customary (de facto) in Northern states. The patterns of residential housing in urban areas provided few instances in which Black and white children attended school together. Black and white children did not live in the same neighborhoods. Since schools were operated on a neighborhood-school basis, housing patterns ensured that they would not go to school together.

Patterns of segregation have now been reversed by court order or through voluntary action by local school authorities or by other voluntary means. Segregated school systems have been merged. This drastic step has been necessary to meet the requirements of the law, Far-reaching busing programs have been put into effect which attempt to have every school in a jurisdiction approximate the proportions of Black and white or other minority school children living within that area.

It should not be surprising that this widespread and rapid mixing of children from different racial and cultural backgrounds in schools, occurring within one generation, has often led to human relations problems in the schools affected. Not only must students associate with students from different backgrounds, but teachers also have had to learn to conduct themselves so that all students in their classes receive fair treatment and have equal opportunities for educational development. Difficult corrective actions accompanying desegregation probably will continue to be necessary for a long time to come. The federal government has responded to the problem to some extent through the Emergency School Aid Act. This act provides assistance to school districts undergoing desegregation, but the amount of federal funding and the services which federal funds can provide are only a small part of what is needed to make desegregation truly effective in American

schools.

Handicapped Students

The most recent major development in American education concerns the need to accommodate handicapped students. Despite the general assumption that education was universal, schools, in fact, excluded significant numbers of handicapped students or failed to educate them without consideration of their particular needs. Many handicapped students were denied public education because the schools felt themselves unable to cope with their special needs. In such cases, either the parents assumed the enormous burden of paying for private education or the child received little or no education of any kind. As recently as the 1975-76 school year, only fifty-eight percent of handicapped children ages 6-19, and only thirty-eight percent of these in the age category 0-5, were being served. While ninety percent of children in some categories of handicap, such as speech impaired, mentally retarded, and deaf children were being served, other types of handicaps almost were being ignored by the schools. Only thirty-eight percent of learning disabled, nineteen percent of emotionally disturbed, and forty percent of deaf-blind and other multi-handicapped children were being served.[30] This deplorable situation has now been completely changed by the mandate of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. This Act now states that regardless of the nature or severity of their handicap, all handicapped children are entitled to receive a free, appropriate public education. This education must be offered to all handicapped children from age three (or whatever the state sets as minimum age of school attendance) to age twenty-one. Although parents still may choose to send their children to private schools, this would be at the parent's discretion because the child is entitled to receive a public

education.

The act also makes major changes in the quality and nature of services to be provided to handicapped children. The act requires that an Individualized Educational Program, or IEP, be developed for each handicapped child. The IEP includes an analysis of the child's present achievement level, a listing of short-range and annual goals, and an identification of specific services that will be provided toward meeting those goals. The teacher has a central role in the development of the IEP as well as in the delivery of the services. This role requires high-level skills in educational assessment and educational planning as well as substantive knowledge of special education.

In addition to guaranteeing the child a public education, the act established by law the principle of educating handicapped children in the least restrictive environment. This means that a school district cannot routinely establish schools for the blind, for example, or schools for the physically handicapped or schools for the mentally retarded. It must first make a concerted effort to consider educating each handicapped child in a general classroom, with auxiliary aids and services if necessary, and then, only as necessary, move the child to more restrictive environments away from the general school population. Only as a last resort may children whose needs cannot be satisfied in less restrictive environments be educated in special schools solely with other handicapped children.

Under the least restrictive environment requirements of P.L. 94-142, it is very likely that most classrooms now will contain at least one handicapped child who would not have been present in that classroom a few years ago. School facilities must be altered to accommodate the needs of students in wheelchairs, blind students, and others with varying physical and emotional

handicaps. Auxiliary services must be provided to deal with the needs of children who were not previously served by the public schools. More importantly, teachers must be equipped with an understanding of the particular needs of handicapped students and the skills required to meet those needs without diminishing the quality of educational services and while still preserving educational opportunity for the non-handicapped children in their classrooms. Adapting to these sweeping changes is a major challenge to teachers and to the flexibility of the American educational system. An estimated seven percent of children born each year (about 200,000) have congenital handicaps. Of children between ages 0-19, there are approximately 2.3 million speech impaired, 2.0 million with learning disabilities, 1.5 million mentally retarded, 1.3 million emotionally disturbed, 328,000 crippled and impaired, 328,000 hard of hearing, 66,000 visually handicapped and 49,000 who are deaf.[31] Educating these children in public school settings will be the greatest challenge to educators in the remainder of this century.

JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

Increasingly stringent demands have been placed on educators by a series of major court cases and legislative acts. The landmark event in overturning the existing pattern of racial segregation in public education was the decision in *Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education* rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954.[32] This decision (*Brown I*) rejected the venerable "separate but equal" doctrine which had been established by the Court in *Plessy vs. Ferguson* (1896).[33] The Court ruled in the *Brown* decision that, even if the education offered Black and white children in segregated schools had been "equal" by available indicators of quality, separation by race was inherently

unconstitutional under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Although the *Brown* decision represented the final repudiation of the "separate but equal" doctrine, it was only the culmination of a series of cases in which defendants consistently found that they had to convince the Supreme Court that "separate" could not be "equal" (e.g., *McLaurin vs. Oklahoma State Regents* (1950)[34] and *Sweatt vs. Painter* (1959).[35] The follow-up *Brown II* decision (1955) held that desegregation was to be ended "with all deliberate speed."[36]

It should be noted that the *Brown* decison applied initially only to legally-mandated racial segregation (de jure). In later cases (e.g., *Keyes vs. School District No. 1*, Denver, Colorado (1973)[37]), the principle established by *Brown* was applied to cover situations in which it could be shown that segregation resulted from the official acts of legislative bodies or administrators. In the major case of *Buchanan vs. Evans* (1975)[38], for example, the Supreme Court held that racial segregation of the Wilmington, Delaware, schools had been caused by the action of the state legislature when it had exempted the Wilmington School District from a law requiring school district consolidation. However, de facto segregation resulting from racially-separated housing patterns, in the absence of official action supporting segregation, did not trigger court-imposed desegregation.

Where unlawful discrimination was found, the courts were willing to order far-reaching remedial actions. The decision in *Green vs. County School Board* (1968)[39] held that school officials have an affirmative duty to eliminate the vestiges of state-imposed segregation. The decision of *Swann vs. Charlotte-Mecklenberg* (1971)[40] established the principle that reasonable busing of students might be required in order to carry out a school desegregation plan

and achieve a unitary school system. When it was necessary to implement court-ordered desegregation, the courts even superseded the authority of recalcitrant locally-elected school officials (e.g., *Morgan vs. Hennigan* (1974),[41] in which Federal Judge W. Arthur Garrity, Jr. assumed control of the public schools from the Boston School Committee). Despite some well-publicized situations in which there was violent resistance to court-ordered desegregation, the U.S.Civil Rights Commission found that most school desegregation was carried out peacefully and successfully.[42]

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

A decade after the Brown decision, Congress enacted the nation's first major civil rights legislation since Reconstruction. The omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1964 contains two titles of specific significance for public education. Title VI of the Act prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, religion, or national origin in educational programs receiving federal funds. Recipients of federal funds have been defined very broadly by subsequent court decisions, and if any program at an institution receives federal funds, all activities of the institution must adhere to federal guidelines of the Civil Rights Acts.

Title VI covers the activities of schools with respect to their students. Activities relating to employees are covered by other federal statutes and court orders. The penalty for non-compliance with Title VI is the termination of all federal funding to the institution following an investigation and hearing process.

In addition to the penalties for racial discrimination contained in Title VI, the Civil Rights Act also contains Title IV which provides federal financial assistance to school districts undergoing desegregation. Title IV

is administered by the U.S. Department of Education. It provides funds for twenty General Assistance Centers to provide local school districts with ongoing technical assistance for desegregation and provides funds to local school districts for short-term teacher in-service training and other activities in support of desegregation. Additional federal aid for desegregating schools was provided by the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) of 1970, succeeded by the present Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) enacted in 1972. The ESAA provides federal financial assistance to eligible school districts for other activities related to the process of eliminating, reducing, and preventing minority group isolation, or for operating an integrated school.

Compensatory Education

In the same period of social change which prompted the passage of the Civil Rights Act, Congress passed the massive Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Repeatedly amended, the various titles of the ESEA embody the federal government's continued commitment to the resolution of serious national educational problems in elementary and secondary education. The largest and most important program authorized by the act was Title I. This program provided assistance for educationally disadvantaged students in need of services. Although Title I authorizes services to both elementary and secondary students, the majority of services have been provided to elementary students due to funding limitations. The Title I program provides additional resources for use by classroom teachers as well as funds for reading specialists and other specialized personnel to meet the educational needs of disadvantaged students. Title I also acted as a major contributor to the concept of parental involvement. Each local Title I project is required to

have a Parent Advisory Committee which has significant impact on Title I program content and administration.

Other titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act also introduced federal support for other educational needs. Funds were provided for textbooks and audiovisual equipment (Title II), for the improvement of guidance and counseling services and for local innovative projects (Title III), for research (Title IV), for strengthening state administration (Title V), for the education of the handicapped (Title VI), and for bilingual education (Title VII). Besides demonstrating federal concern, each of these titles increased the resources available for training classroom teachers and other school personnel and increased the expectations of teacher performance in dealing with the types of student needs which these new federal programs were intended to address.

EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION

Early Childhood Education

There also was a substantial educational impact from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This act established the Head Start program (now administered by the Office of Human Development Services) to provide educational and other remedial services to economically disadvantaged preschool children and the Follow Through program (administered by the Department of Education) to extend children's gains from Head Start into the early primary grades. Both Head Start and Follow Through also require parent advisory groups for each local project, and have both been instrumental in strengthening parental involvement and influence in the communities in which the projects operate. Although neither Head Start nor Follow Through are

"universal" programs like Title I, they represent the first substantial federal commitment to early childhood education and have been influential as models. Follow Through, in particular, was administered as a demonstration program and evolved thoroughly tested alternative models for early childhood education.

Bilingual Education

The consequences of the Brown decision and the Civil Rights Act relating to racial desegregation have been followed by other judicial and legislative developments which have substantially changed the school's responsibilities toward bilingual students, women, and the handicapped. The legal rights of bilingual students were established in the decision in *Lau vs. Nichols* in 1974.[43] In a class action suit, non-English speaking Chinese students in San Francisco who were not receiving supplemental instruction in English alleged that the school system's failure to rectify their language deficiency was in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and of the implementing regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). The Supreme Court decided in favor of the students concluding that the failure to provide supplemental English courses denied these students a meaningful opportunity to participate in the educational program. The Supreme Court explicitly relied upon the Civil Rights Act as a basis for its decision and did not address the question of whether the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution had been violated. Some other court decisions (e. g., *Arvizu vs. Waco Independent School District*)[44], however, have relied on the equal protection clause to order extensive bilingual-bicultural programs even in cases where the segregation of minority students within the school system was not the result of official action. It seems

clear that bilingual-bicultural education may be ordered by a Federal District Court on the basis of the equal protection clause as part of the remedy in cases involving either de jure or de facto segregation of Spanish-speaking or other national-origin minority students.

The Department of HEW took several actions as a result of the *Lau* decision. The Office of Civil Rights required development of voluntary compliance by school districts found to be in non-compliance with Title VI relative to national-origin minority group children with English-language problems. General Assistance Centers (called "*Lau* Centers") were established to provide technical assistance in the development of these compliance plans. Throughout the 1970's, funding for the Bilingual Education program was increased to develop curriculum materials, train teachers, and otherwise assist in the expansion of program services to bilingual students required to meet the *Lau* mandate. Despite the general emerging surplus of elementary and secondary teachers, there was a shortage of qualified teachers for the bilingual programs being established in response to *Lau*. This shortage likely will persist for some time, as will the debates as to what program structures can best serve the special educational needs of the bilingual child and the administrative difficulties associated with establishing bilingual programs.

Educational Equity

The process of removing discrimination among various groups of students took another significant step forward with the passage of Title IX of the Higher Education Act. Title IX specifically prohibits discrimination in federally-assisted educational programs on the basis of sex. Like Title VI, the penalty for non-compliance is the withdrawal of all federal funding.

Unlike Title VI, Title IX applies to employment as well as to admissions and the provision of services to students. Although less severe in it effects than the Title VI prohibition on racial discrimination, Title IX also has significant effects on teaching and educational practice generally. It has required the extension of additional opportunities to women in athletics, modifications of guidance programs, and a general effort to overcome sex stereotyping. As a civil rights statute, Title IX is also enforced by the Office for Civil Rights. It was accompanied by the passage of the Women's Educational Equity Act, administered by the Department of Education, which provides limited grants for projects to demonstrate methods of increasing opportunities for women in education, to develop sex-free materials, and to train educational administrators.

Legislation for the Handicapped

A prohibition against discrimination against handicapped persons in HEW-assisted activities was added in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The most significant section is Section 504, which reads:

> No qualified handicapped individual shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Regulations to implement Section 504 were published in the *Federal Register* on May 4, 1977.

Section 504 is a Civil Rights statute, and it, too, is enforced by the Office of Civil Rights. Like Title VI and Title IX, the penalty for violation, after an investigation and a hearing, is the withdrawal of federal funds. Section 504 is applicable to nearly every health, education, and social welfare agency in the U.S. The regulations emphasize institutional

self-analysis and voluntary compliance

Section 504 is a broad statute. It applies to employment practices as well as to an educational institution's actions with respect to applicants and students. It interrelates with the requirements established by P.L. 94-142 for educational services to handicapped students. The regulations for P.L. 94-142 are incorporated into the regulations for Section 504. Therefore, it is presumed that a public school operating programs for handicapped children under an approved state plan under P.L. 94-142 is also in compliance with the educational service requirements of Section 504.

It is important to note that Section 504 requires educational changes of far greater magnitude than earlier civil rights statutes. Title VI does not demand substantive changes in program content or services. Title IX also requires the elimination of artificial barriers based on sex which may result in some program modifications, but the scope of any such changes, and their cost, are not severe.

Section 504, however, may require substantial program changes and costly alterations of physical facilities. It is not possible to offer standardized services to handicapped students. Therefore, special services must be offered to meet the individual needs of each handicapped student. All of the foregoing mandates place a major, continuing responsibility on the teachers of today and on the institutions which train the teachers of tomorrow.

Students Rights

In 1954, the courts began their succession of rulings on student rights and education. During the nation's festering social problems in the 1960's, the civil rights movement erupted. In addition, the tragic impact of the Vietnam War and Black militancy contributed to the volatile atmosphere of the

era. The nation's major cities were the scenes of pillage and rioting. While some schools were targets of violence, others were selectively untouched. Such actions may symbolize the ambivalent aspirations people had for schools. They may have felt both despair and rage about the schools' inability to provide equal access to educational opportunity. In any case, it was clear that the less-privileged groups did not perceive their problems to be the upgrading of science and mathematics programs in order to maintain national, scientific, and technological superiority.

Instead, national attention focused on the fact that public education was not meeting the needs of our disadvantaged minorities. In spite of all the changes in curricula, inner-city schools remained very much what they had always been--the domain of apathy, low reading scores, and high drop-out rates.

REMEDIATION OF DEFICIENCIES IN TEACHING

Teacher Training Legislation

A pattern emerges as one reviews the educational legislation written between 1958 and 1968, This particular legislation was shaped in large part by a series of crises related to the "re-discovery" of poverty. Three major acts of Congress dominated the decade; the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. Yet several other laws also authorized particular programs which complemented those pieces of 1960's social legislation. These include the amendments to the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 (including the 1964 amendment to the NDEA known as Title XI), the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), and the Educational Professions Development Act (EPDA) of 1967.

REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Originally, the legislation just referred to (NDEA, HEA, and EPDA) had in common an attempt to introduce the academic disciplines into the training of teachers. The most interesting elements of a pattern now discernable were (1) a constantly broadening vision of intra- and inter-agency cooperation with heightened awareness of previously unrecognized relationships between and among institutions and groups, (2) greater participation in the educational enterprise by social groups and "outsiders" previously written off as unimportant, and (3) a realignment of levels of authority and power in education.

This pattern was most visible during the late 1960's when both the war on poverty and the struggle for civil liberties were being fought on many fronts and the notion of "participatory democracy" was becoming widespread.

Title XI (the 1964 amendment to the NDEA) provided increased funds and widened the base of the original institute program by supporting many new subject areas including English, history, and geography. The effort was to make explicit, and to institutionalize, some of the developing cross-program cooperation that occurred. A major reorganization of the Office of Education (OE) came during the following year, 1966. Most of the teacher training programs in the disciplines, special education, and counseling and guidance were brought together under a new OE Division of Educational Personnel Training. This division was responsible for the administration of nine separate laws with an annual appropriation of $73 million. Moreover, this division was later expanded into a Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

Finally, it became possible with this new alignment of staff and money to link the goals and activities of programs previously seen as distinct. In

fact, OE staff were able to combine programs from several different pieces of legislation in a manner expressing a new awareness of the scope of problems.

Teacher Training for the Disadvantaged

Shortly afterward, a new category of clientele was designated as *Disadvantaged.* Another amendment to the NDEA provided funds not only to help teachers learn more about their subject matter but to change the material in accordance with their students' needs. Title XI contained a "sleeper" aimed directly at improving the qualifications of those teachers "who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching of disadvantaged youth." Congress, under the impetus of writing the Economic Opportunity Act, was shifting its focus from improving schools to improving society. The new amendment more or less described the disadvantaged as "...culturally, economically, socially, and educationally handicapped youth, in need of specialized training."[45] Students heretofore written off as drop-outs, emotionally disturbed, or "dumb", became a new group of people invited into the schoolhouse. They were promised more space, money, programs, and more teachers. It was plain from Section 1101 (2) of Title XI that schooling was a function of, and inseparable from, society and its ills. Thus, the twin goals of improving both the educational process *and* society was a "requirement" of future legislation.

Soon the commitment to notions of a broad "federal role" in education and society reached a zenith. *The Higher Education Act of 1965* stated the belief that the time had come for colleges and universities to face the problems of the city as they once faced problems of the farm and to realize that disadvantaged children were different, and schooling must adapt to this circumstance. The Teacher Corps, established under this Act, was a tangible and active assault on poverty.

REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

TEACHERS CORPS

As originally planned, the Corps was to attract and train "inexperienced teacher-interns" and "qualified teachers" with baccalaureate degrees to work at the elementary and secondary levels "...in areas having concentrations of low-income families."[46] In actuality, the experienced teacher component of the program was not implemented originally. In addition, the only substantial retraining that was carried out under this part of the Title was short-course training provided for the experienced teacher leaders assigned to work with teams of teacher-interns. This portion of the act gave consideration to offering concrete teaching experiences to the interns engaged in the program. This enabled the universities and colleges participating in Teacher Corps training to design and expand methods for preparing teachers for classroom work. It also gave interns the opportunity to gain actual teaching experience while assigned to local educational agencies and to offer interns the opportunity to begin and continue their work for higher degrees.

With the coming of the teacher surplus and subsequent amendments, the Teacher Corps made several significant shifts in its teacher training direction. It changed its focus from that of training massive numbers of new, inexperienced teacher-interns each year to the training of existing, experienced teachers (in-service) and teacher aides. With this advent, the Corps now trains only four inexperienced teacher interns per funded project.

The Education Amendments of 1976 created still another new direction for Teacher Corps. This amendment put the Corps further into the demonstration modality. The demonstration strategy increased the length of projects from two to five years and increased the collaboration between local school agencies, institutions of higher education and communities in establishing and

implementing projects. It also established the requirement for the participation of an elected Community Council in carrying out local projects. The increased emphasis on demonstration required improved planning, documentation, institutionalization or adoption, and dissemination of proven teacher training designs.

EXPERIENCED TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Part C of Title V funds were used to implement an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program designed to provide graduate fellowships leading to a master's degree for teachers interested in a career in elementary and secondary school teaching. It is interesting that this provision was put in the Higher Education Act since Congress also was considering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, where the provision's inclusion may have seemed more appropriate.

The responsiveness of the Office of Education to the legislation and to student needs was demonstrated by the way in which the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program guidelines were developed, interpreted, and the program administered. Teachers were given new opportunities to learn more about disadvantaged children by working in inner city classrooms with college professors who were more aware of educational realities. The results were that a nation-wide learning experience occurred for both sets of teachers. At the same time, by bringing teachers as groups onto college campuses, the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program also helped change some traditional academic departments.

A final authorization in the Higher Education Act of 1965 was made to establish short-term workshops as well as short-term and regular-session

institutes at institutions of higher learning for educational media specialists.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT

All of this helped to shape the creation and administration of the Education Professions Development Act. Now, for the first time, a law authorized awarding funds directly to the schools. This law no longer made it necessary to support only institutions of higher education in connection with teacher training. Funds were now available for "other educational personnel" in addition to conventional teachers. The aim, of course, was to "get something going" in the schools by reaching out into the community and altering the community feelings toward the schools by transforming the school into an agency for social change. By becoming the focus of social action, schools had to discover not only "themselves", but the other worlds of "minorities" and the "community."

The Education Professions Development Act evolved in two ways. First, it was an amendment to Title V of the Higher Education Act which resulted in extending the life of the Congressionally popular Teacher Corps. Secondly, it brought together existing and new programs into a unified statute that would, for the first time, give the Office of Education the authority to train all kinds of educational personnel for all levels of education.

It should be noted that the EDPA represented a turn away from doctoral-level, subject-matter specialists who were supported and trained by NDEA funds and a shift toward more generalist personnel to be trained for a variety of educational responsibilities. Unlike the NDEA, the EDPA did not concentrate on the Ph.D. degree, nor did it concentrate on the upper instructional

levels. Moreso than past legislation, the EDPA reflected a growing concern for the manpower needs of the elementary and secondary schools, a consequently decreasing emphasis on the doctorate, and a re-evaluation of the training of educational para-professionals.

In the past, the significant personnel training bills administered by the Office of Education had been categorical bills. That is, Congress exercised its authority and indicated its intent to the Office by enumerating specific purposes, amounts of dollars, levels of education, numbers of fellowships, and kinds of institutions to be affected by various legislation. The Education Professions Development Act departed from this pattern substantially.

In theory, at least, the discretionary nature of the EPDA legislation seemed to decrease Congressional influence. Because the implementation of the bill was left to the Office of Education, the Executive Branch of the government achieved greater control over the directions the bill took. The discretionary nature of the bill also provided the Office with the opportunity to implement its own priorities and to tie the bill to educational reform.

In practice, however, the discretionary nature of the bill was limited. Because EPDA, like so many previous pieces of legislation, was intended by the Congress to continue and expand earlier authorized programs (like the Teacher Corps), the amount of discretionary funds that remained to be used discretely was substantially decreased.

In the case of the EPDA, a series of programs evolved that attempted to improve and increase educational personnel (teachers, administrators, counselors, etc.) at all levels of the nation's educational activity. Past programs were continued from the HEA and the NDEA, and new programs were designed to increase personnel for such priority areas as drug abuse, career

opportunities, Black colleges, early childhood development, teacher leadership, education for the handicapped, media specialists, as well as that of teacher training and development. These programs were carried out through a variety of fellowships, development aid, short-term and regular session institutes and through in-service and pre-service projects.

As already stated, the EPDA was intended to collect and coordinate a variety of existing and new education manpower programs, and to provide a comprehensive response to education manpower needs. A fact of this legislation and previous pieces of legislation is that Congress clearly articulated in each of them the need for more education manpower research than was available prior to the enactment of not only the Education Professions Development Act, but of any previous legislation affecting education manpower requirements.[47]

Even before passage of the EPDA, which specifically authorized grants to local education agencies (via State Plans), the granting of more authority to local education agencies (LEAs) had been a matter of concern to Congress, especially after Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. Congress had already noted that too few advisory committee members were either state or local school board members or were actively engaged in teaching in elementary or secondary schools. Congress underscored its concern by granting funds directly to local school agencies. Teacher training programs more suited to the needs of local communities could now be designed. The bureaucrats could now demand more emphasis on recruiting and training poor people, members of minority groups, and other individuals not previously associated with the school establishment. As a consequence, following the lead of the Teacher Corps, the Trainers of Teacher Trainers'

Program and the Career Opportunities Program eventually emerged as the primary efforts to meet this demand of the new populism.

TRAINERS OF TEACHER TRAINERS

The dream of the Triple T Program originators was to change the methods of teaching teachers to train teachers and to involve people in the community in the learning process on a far more comprehensive scale than ever before and thereby to improve the quality of education for all the children of the United States.

Anyone interested in the chronicle of teacher education in America would do well to study three characteristics of the Triple T Program.

1. *The Triple T attempted to influence education with a whole new federal approach.* Until 1968, the general practice had been to tinker with mechanisms at the public school level; i.e., change courses (new math, for example), create new types of classrooms, build new buildings, obtain new equipment, or lower student-teacher ratio. With Triple T, the emphasis was switched to *human change*, since it attempted to improve the quality of college level professors who teach prospective teachers. For the first time, federal attention was focused on curricula at teachers colleges, on students' practice teaching at teachers colleges, on the role of liberal arts professors in educating these students, in fact, on all of the things that go together to mold future classrooms teachers.
2. *The Triple T was the first federal program in education to attempt linking formally all the individuals and groups concerned with the education of the elementary school child.* Termed "parity" and aiming

toward a rough kind of equal responsibility on the educational scene, this approach was designed to involve everyone from the mathematics professor and the psychology instructor at the university, through the undergraduate or graduate education student, to the classroom teacher, school principal, and district superintendent, on out to parents and members of the community. Here was something truly innovative in education schemes, a product of the thinking of the 1960's whereby it was held that broad "participatory democracy" should be sought at all levels of society.

3. *The Triple T was one of the largest federal programs in education during the last generation, certainly the most comprehensive program at the university level.* It involved fifty-eight institutions of higher education in twenty-four states, from the District of Columbia to California and from Wisconsin to Florida. And the institutions were deliberately heterogeneous: large and small, public and private, famous and obscure. They included research-oriented universities (Harvard and Berkeley), as well as regional institutions (Appalachian State and George Peabody), both major state teacher-oriented universities (Michigan State and Indiana) and more select schools (Chicago and Pittsburgh). On another level, Triple T also involved several hundred elementary and secondary schools across the nation since each Triple T university worked with at least one school district in its area and usually with a number of different schools. It has been estimated that the program engaged some 42,000 people, 12,000 of them elementary school teachers. The scope was truly prodigious: from ghetto schools in New York to barrio schools in

southern California, from high schools in Michigan to primary schools in Florida, from a small Indian school in North Dakota to rural Black schools in Alabama.[48]

In spite of its relatively short lifetime, Triple T was an extraordinary program. As with most innovative experiments, it must be measured not only by the practical results but also by the new ideas it spawned.

The three original specific Triple T program goals, as conceived by the Office of Education staff early in the program, remained fairly stable:

- To develop more effective programs for training educators, both in institutions of higher learning and in the schools;

- to increase the competency of persons currently serving as trainers both in institutions of higher learning and in the schools; and

- to identify, recruit, and train qualified individuals as Teacher Trainers (TT's) and Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT's).[49]

By the autumn of 1969, the Triple T Program had two more objectives: to institutionalize program effects within the funded training agency and to extend these effects to other non-funded institutions. Thus, by November, 1970, the TTT Program had five major goals:

- To focus projects on the identification, recruitment, and training of TTT's;

- to find a balance (parity) among the consumers concerned with the training of educational personnel;

- to include in the program the best of recent educational developments and deal with critical current educational issues;

- to institutionalize improvements resulting from TTT projects; and

- to develop strategies through each project that would achieve a maximum multiplier effect.[50]

In its short life, between 1968 and 1973, Triple T distributed forty million dollars in federal funds to fifty-eight universities. It had a full and dramatic life which, though it ended prematurely, was eventful.

REASONS FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was first funded in fiscal year 1969 at $10,800,000 and increased in fiscal year 1970 to $24,300,000. Like most of the other teacher training programs within the OE at the time, the COP was administered by the now-defunct Bureau of Educational Personnel Development and may be considered as representative of most of the objectives and policies of the Bureau and the act which funded it.

The COP was a national effort to improve the learning ability of low-income children, particularly in urban areas. The key to this effort was the recruitment of low-income community residents and Vietnam War veterans to work as para-professionals in poverty-area education school systems. About twenty-eight percent of the participants were veterans. A small percentage of handicapped persons were also recruited into the projects as aides.

The COP was a work-study program. While the para-professionals, or auxiliaries, were working in the schools, they were provided with released time to allow them to continue training toward eventual certification. The local education agencies, which were the major recipients of COP grants, negotiated independently with local colleges and universities and cooperated with them in developing feasible teacher-training projects. Both the LEA and the local college were co-developers and co-signers of the application. The applications also had to be endorsed and signed by the local Model Cities representative, to assure two things: first, that those cities designated as Model Cities were sufficiently covered by COP funds; and second, that any non-Model City area proposed to be supported by a grant would meet the poverty guidelines established for the program.

The Education Professions Development Act generally prohibited the

payment of salaries or stipends. The COP was an exception to this rule. COP would pay up to $90 a week, plus tuition, to veterans participating in the program, and it did not affect the veteran's GI Bill benefits. For non-veterans, the cost of tuition was paid. In all cases, however, cooperative funding was strongly encouraged with local school systems involving cost sharing of the projects with other federal, state, or local entities.

URBAN/RURAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

One other program established under the EPDA worth noting is The Urban/Rural School Development Program. The central concept of Urban/Rural was to develop a new parity between school and community. Furthermore, the program attempted to foster greater cooperation between school and community by lessening the adverse implications for teachers of the community control concept and to eradicate the disillusionment felt by parents in low-income communities. Also, it attempted to instill parents with a sense of the importance of their unique role as participants on community advisory boards.

The Urban/Rural projects contained several elements which gave them a unique character among school-community cooperative efforts. These elements were (1) at least half the members of a school/community council were to be non-school people; (2) the curricula for each planned site was to fit the needs and circumstances of that particular community; (3) control of the funds was to be in the hands of the council (with school board concurrence); and (4) efforts were to concentrate on training school personnel and the development of community educational resources.

The impact of the Urban/Rural projects was felt in both the curriculum which emphasized local needs and in school governance. Community perceptions

of the school and of the possibility of access by community people to influence the system changed positively at sites where collaboration was effective. Also, there is some evidence of spill-over effects from the Urban/Rural project sites into neighboring school districts.[51]

SUMMARY

What characterized many programs funded under the EPDA was their transitory nature. Perhaps because of this transitory nature there was less pressure to articulate long-term objectives. Or perhaps the failure to state convincingly what those objectives were is one reason these programs disappeared.

This transient state of affairs was generally recognized by staff and personnel in the Office of Education in the early 1970's. Also it must have been sensed by individuals outside the OE who spoke on behalf of those institutions which were intended to benefit from federal monies. Why should any institution make any long-term commitment to a federal program if it can receive no assurance that federal funds will extend to the length of the commitment? Such half-heartedness tended to further entrench colleges and universities in their belief that the federal government is simply an intermittent source of funds, and not a source of technical knowledge, stable financial support, or program leadership.

In summary, during the years 1958-68, the "message" behind the legislation was first, outrage at the deficiencies of the American schools, next, a discovery that to remedy the deficiencies would require schools of education and colleges and universities to join forces to produce better teachers, and finally, guilt at the realization that efforts at "school

reform" were utterly remote from the needs and interests of the disadvantaged as well as from the realities of "middle America." Each of these discoveries led to a re-examination of the schools in terms of the "larger society," and each challenged the power of entrenched "professionalism."

In the recent past, the response of the federal government was to concentrate on alleviating inequities among recipients of program funds. The government also gave serious attention to teacher education by developing and funding such efforts as Trainers of Teachers Trainers (Triple T), Teacher Corps, the Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models (CETEM) Project, Teacher Centers, the National Institute of Education (NIE), the Education Renewal Project, multi-cultural education, and bilingual education. *From these programs has come the rapid emergence of the basis for a profession of teaching with a genuine professional culture.*

It is obvious that federal programs supporting the search for better ways to educate teachers and teacher trainers have had an important influence on teacher education practice. Many new approaches have been developed. Much less successful, however, has been the effort to institutionalize the new programs. Professional acculturation of teachers has been significantly advanced; yet there has been a counterproductive failure to assist teacher education institutions to increase the length of programs so that teachers could really be "professionalized". This has been one of the major flaws in the efforts of EPDA and other U.S. Office of Education programs. *In order to make effective use of the new conceptual insights and instructional techniques, the teacher education process requires a significantly longer learning and practicing period.*

However, the federal presence in education has been clearly

established. In addition, it is well recognized as fact that the federal courts and the federal government have the power to change education. Therefore, the federal role turns logically toward interventions in pursuit of national goals as the responsibility for delivering education to the citizenry remains vested in the states.

In its earlier efforts, the United States Office of Education used the form of categorical aid to disperse its resources. This permitted the "building of lighthouses" to serve as models for others. More recently, Congress initiated "revenue sharing," the giving of grants to states to be used within the intended purposes as decided by the individual states. To many educators, however, there is much concern about the fact that discretionary federal programs of the revenue sharing nature may cause categorical aid to be diminished. "Lighthouse" or "model-building" is one of the ways to promote the public good; sponsorship of efforts to produce new knowledge is another. Resources for these two research and development purposes are not generally available at the state institutions or local agencies responsible for providing or funding educational programs and services. Rarely is significant attention given in state educational systems to research and development since program operations are all-consuming of resources. Without continued federal support, development and research efforts will suffer.

Over the past forty years, the federal government has entered many new realms of social policymaking--in health, welfare, social insurance, employment and unemployment assistance, and education. These developments were in response to the increasingly complex and interdependent nature of our society and economy as well as to a growing national legislative and judicial

commitment to concepts of equal opportunity and treatment. In education, specifically, the political and economic benefits of a well-educated citizenry became more manifest and more national in character as geographical mobility increased and regional economic and social interests diminished.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Roald F. Campbell, R & D Funding Policies of The National Institute of Education (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1975), p. 109.

[2]Michael Timpane, "Federal Education Programs and Their Effect on Teacher Education", AACTE Yearbook 1977 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977), p. 84.

[3]John F. Jennings, "Federal General Aid--Likely or Illusory", Journal of Law and Education, II (January, 1973), p. 89.

[4]House Committee on Education and Labor, Compilation of Federal Education Laws, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 394.

[5]National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, Sixth Annual Report "A Question of Stewardship, (March, 1972), p. 66.

[6]Ibid.; p. 67.

[7]Donald N. Bigelow, ed. SCHOOLWORLDS '76: New Directions for Educational Policy (Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1976), p. ix.

[8]National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, op cit., p. 68.

[9]House Committee on Education/Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, op. cit., pp. 247, 549.

[10]Ibid., p. 550.

[11]U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 285, "Mobility of the Population of the United States: March, 1970, to March, 1975", (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), Table B.

[12]Ibid., Table A.

[13]Ibid., Figure 4.

[14]Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights; Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts, Fall, 1972; (Washington, D.C.: Department of HEW, 1972).

[15]U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 285, op. cit., Table 30.

[16]Ibid., Figure 2.

[17]U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population

Reports, Series P-20, No. 290, "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March, 1975" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), Figure 2.

[18]Ibid, Table K.

[19]Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights; op. cit., n.p.

[20]Kurt J. Snapper, Harriett H. Barriga, Faye H. Baumgarner, and Charles S. Wagner, The Status of Children 1975 (Washington, D.C.: Social Research Group, The George Washington University, 1975) Figure 1.6.

[21]Ibid., Figure 1.7.

[22]Advisory Committee on Child Development, National Research Council, Toward a National Policy for Children and Families (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976), Figure 1.

[23]George H. Gallup, "Eighth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, LVII (October, 1976), pp. 187-200.

[24]Mary A. Golladay, The Condition of Education (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977), Table 2.12.

[25]Snapper, et.al., op cit., Figure 1.13.

[26]Golladay, op. cit., Table 4.12.

[27]Ibid., Table 4.15.

[28]Ibid., Table 4.19.

[29]Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[30]National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, 1976 Annual Report, The Unfinished Revolution: Education for the Handicapped (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976), Table 1.

[31]Kurt J. Snapper, et. al., op. cit., p. 27.

[32]Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, op. cit.

[33]Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

[34]McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents, 339 U.S. 637 (1950).

[35]Sweatt v. Painter, 339 U.S. 629 (1959).

[36]Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294, at 300 (1955).

[37]Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado, 413 U.S. 189 (1973).

[38]Buchanan v. Evans, 423 U.S. 963 (1975).

[39]Green v. County School Board, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

[40]Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 189 (1973).
[41]Morgan v. Hennigan, 379 F. Supp. 410 (D. Mass., 1974).

[42]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law: Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1976).

[43]Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

[44]Arvizu v. Waco Independent School District, 373 F. Supp. 1264, 1269 (WD Tex., 1974).

[45]House Committee on Education and Labor/Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, A Compilation of Federal Education Laws (Through 12/31/74) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 358.

[46]Ibid., p. 442.

[47]National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, op. cit., p. 69.

[48]Malcolm M. Provus, The Grand Experiment (Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1975), pp. 1-3

[49]Ibid., p. 20.

[50]Ibid., p. 21.

[51]James V. Terry and Robert D. Hess, The Urban/Rural School Development Program: An Examination of a Federal Model for Achieving Parity between Schools and Communities (mimeograph) (Stanford, California: Leadership Training Institute, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1974), pp. 1-3, 69.

Chapter 4

4

RECENT FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

This chapter will provide brief summaries of the federal educational programs of the present and recent past which have devoted their monies or a portion of their monies to the training and retraining of educational personnel. The first program discussed is the Educational Personnel Development Act (EPDA) of 1967 and three of the Act's most successful programs, Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT), the Career Opportunities Program (COP), and Urban Rural School Development. The discussion then moves to present-day efforts in teacher education, beginning with the consideration of the two major U.S. Office of Education training programs, Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers. The remainder of the chapter presents short synopses of more than thirty-five educational programs within the Department of Education which devote some or all of their funds to the training or retraining of educational personnel. For the sake of organizational clarity, these programs have been divided into three categories: those programs which address the special needs of identified populations such as bilingual, disadvantaged, or exceptional

children; vocational, adult, and career education programs, including specialized career training programs such as library or guidance and counseling training; and a wide range of smaller discretionary grant programs which contain teacher training components. Following is an outline of the programs to be covered:

I. Educations Personnel Development Act
   A. Trainers of Teacher Trainers
   B. Career Opportunities Program
   C. Urban/Rural School Development

II. Teacher training programs
   A. Teacher Corps
   B. Teacher Centers

III. Aid to populations with special needs
   A. Title I
   B. Head Start
   C. Follow Through
   D. Civil Rights
   E. Emergency School Aid Act
   F. Bilingual Education
   G. Indo-China Refugee Act
   H. Indian Education
   I. Gifted and Talented
   J. Education for the Handicapped
      1. Special Education Manpower Development Act
      2. Regional Resource Centers
      3. Deaf/Blind Centers
      4. Innovation and Development
      5. Specific Learning Disabilities
      6. Early Childhood Education
      7. Severely Handicapped Projects

IV. Vocational, adult, and career education programs
   A. Vocational Education
      1. Vocational Educational Personnel Development
      2. Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program
      3. Research training
   B. Adult Education
   C. Career Education
   D. Library Career Training
   E. Libary Demonstration and Research
   F. Guidance and Counseling

V. Other programs with training components
   A. Right to Read
   B. Alcohol and Drug Abuse

C. Community Education
D. Women's Educational Equity
E. Ethnic Heritage Studies
F. Consumer Education
G. Arts Education
H. Environmental Education
I. Metric Education
J. Division of Educational Replication

EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT ACT

During its short life span, the Educational Personnel Development Act (EPDA), passed in 1967 and phased out beginning in 1972, contributed significantly to the development of new approaches to the training and retraining of educational personnel. Many of these innovations continue to dominate the theory and practice of federally sponsored teacher education programs today. They include:

1. Promoting a partnership among participants in a parity relationship between the community, the university, and the school.

2. Emphasizing "real world" experience rather than "ivory tower" research. Training should be responsive to local needs: it should not be a "lay on".

3. Focusing on aid to disaffected minorities and low income people whose needs have traditionally gone unmet in the educational sphere.

4. Relying on training as a major catalyst for school reform.

5. Employing innovative "differentiated staffing" patterns, including team teaching, flexible scheduling, and the use of teacher aides, and parent volunteers.[1]

While these concepts were not all invented by the architects of EPDA, they were certainly all advanced and strenghtened to a great extent by such programs as Teacher Corps, and pre-EPDA proponents of these ideas--CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM (COP), the TRAINERS OF TEACHERS TRAINERS (TTT), and URBAN/RURAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT.

The purposes of EPDA were stated in fairly broad terms: "to improve the

quality of education and to help meet the critical shortages of adequately trained personnel."[2] Aside from the more specific mandate to develop an accurate assessment of present and long range personnel needs; the means for carrying out the purposes of the act were also stated rather broadly. The act as administered by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (BEPD) was to provide "a broad range of high quality training and retraining opportunities", attract "qualified persons" into the field of education, attract "persons who can stimulate creatively in the arts and other skills", and be "more responsive to the needs of schools and colleges."[3]

The EPDA brought together several different legislative authorities related to personnel training. National Defense Education Act (NDEA) graduate fellowships were continued under EPDA. Leadership development and training in vocational education, Bilingual Education, Education for the Handicapped, and Indian Education were also supported by the act. Other programs developed under the EPDA authority included the Career Opportunities Program (COP), the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT), Urban/Rural School Development, Teacher Training in Developing Institutions, and Pupil Personnel Services.[4] The first three will be discussed later in this chapter.

While the flexibility of the legislation allowed for this wide range of programs, it also led to a lack of direction and cohesiveness within BEPD:

> Some fifteen sharply fragmented, only rarely synchronized programs aimed at everyone in the business from teachers in one-room rural schoolhouses to school superintendents working on Harvard doctorates to unemployed urban ghetto dwellers. Clearly, EPDA was many things to many people.[5]

In an attempt to deal with this fragmentation, BEPD began to develop the concept of "Educational Renewal", in which block grants containing portions of many of the EPDA programs would be awarded. The renewal scheme would allow

for a continuous, comprehensive attack on educational problems. Unfortunately, not only was the project poorly managed, but it was also hampered by Congressional opposition.[6] The shelving of Educational Renewal marked the beginning of the end of EPDA. Promoting expensive, anti-establishment change in a time of conservative Republican administration, and attempting to increase the numbers of professionals entering a field with a problematic manpower surplus, EPDA programs began to be phased out.

Ironically, Congress chose to oppose EPDA at the time when it was critically needed. Although funded to address the teacher shortage, most EPDA programs were, in fact, concerned either with retraining efforts or with training of personnel in specialized fields where shortages still existed.[7] Without the entrance of newly trained classroom teachers, schools were left to be populated by an often obsolete staff, ill-prepared to meet the challenges of the changed American educational environment.

Today, federal initiatives in teacher education are more fragmented than ever, with little or no coordination existing between the various programs with teacher training components. However, many of the positive aspects of the EPDA legacy remained. The Teacher Centers program was funded to address the staff development needs of classroom teachers. The Teacher Corps shifted its focus from pre-service to in-service education. At the same time, it incorporatd many of the EPDA concepts listed earlier into its program, such as collaborative and parity relationships between colleges, school districts, and communities, and the importance of training being focused upon local needs. Finally, as this chapter indicates, many other programs within the Department of Education incorporated the training or retraining of educational personnel as an integral part of their efforts. Examined together, they present an

impressive illustration of the federal role in teacher education.

Trainers of Teacher Trainers

In the forward to *The Grand Experiment*, a book on the "Life and Death of the TTT Program," David E. Purpel described Triple T as:

> ...a remarkable and controversial program, one of the boldest and most imaginatively conceived federal programs in education in this century...a program operated with a minimum of guidelines (that) not only tolerated but even demanded diversity and creativity...[8]

The TTT program had wide scope and grand intentions; it proposed to overhaul the system in which teachers were trained, to involve community members to an unprecedented degree in the educational process, and thereby to improve the quality of education for children in the United States.

The school site, rather than the university lecture hall, was the focus of training activities. The program attempted to place the teaching of education in the "real world" context of poverty, social discontent, disenchanted youth, and racial strife. Each project developed its own unique approach to meeting the overall TTT goals:

- to focus projects on the identification, recruitment and training of trainers of teacher trainers
- to find a balance (parity) among the consumers concerned with the training of educational personnel
- to include in the program the best of recent educational developments and to deal with critical current issues
- to develop strategies through each project that would achieve a maximum multiplier effect.[9]

At the university level, TTT approached educational change through the "gate keepers," the liberal arts and education professors, as well as college administrators, whose job it was to train future teachers. For example, the Hunter College program stated its purpose as follows:

> ...to enable a significant number of liberal arts and education faculty to gain new perspectives and skills that will result in better preparation of teachers for black and Puerto Rican youngsters in the New York City public schools.[10]

Triple T encouraged faculty members to develop a better rapport with the students they taught as well as with the communities and ethnic groups whose members made up the school populations. The latest in educational innovations were studied and employed, such as microteaching, team teaching, and use of simulated materials.[11] An intensive approach to field-based training was stressed, including having student teachers live in their pupils' communities and promoting the working together of student teachers and professors in the school classroom. Finally, TTT fostered interaction between the two traditionally separate liberal arts and education faculties in an attempt to better harmonize content areas with teaching methods.[12]

At the local level, TTT encouraged parental involvement in their children's education to a great degree. It was the first federal program to attempt to involve community members on a parity, rather than advisory, basis in its policy-making and operation. In practice, however, the notion of parity was seldom implemented completely in the turbulent times of the late 1960's and early 1970's.

> Giving the community an equal voice seemed reasonable enough, or at least politically prudent, in theory and even on paper. Very few TTT academicians, however, even really envisioned *actually sharing* power with uneducated or ill-educated blacks and Chicanos... Even projects that applauded the parity idea in theory and intended to try to make it operational found that actually establishing parity, in addition to all the other pressures of a new project, was either too difficult or too time-consuming.[13]

Still, while never living up to intentions, the concept of parity in TTT represented an important step in the directions of greater community control

over education and greater responsiveness on the part of academicians to the needs and desires of the community.

When Congress refused to re-authorize EPDA, TTT was forced to shut down. During its lifetime, from 1968-1973, it engaged an estimated 42,000 participants, working out of as many as fifty-eight colleges and universities as well as several hundred elementary and secondary schools across the nation.[14]

Career Opportunities Program

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) like the Triple T, operated in low-income communities within the context of urban strife and increasing group consciousness of minorities. Although a product of the 1960's, COP did not begin operation until July, 1970, three years after the EPDA legislation had been signed.[15] Its primary task was the training of community members to become classroom aides in local schools. But like many EPDA programs it had broad goals which exceeded it basic purpose. These goals included the improvement of educational opportunities for low income children, encouraging greater community and parent involvement in education, and increasing cooperative relationships between related programs and institutions.[16]

The Career Opportunities Program was instrumental in legitimizing the role of the classroom aide as well as in formalizing career lattices and ladders in which to structure their career advancement, salaries, and responsibilities. It attracted new kinds of people, low-income residents and Vietnam Veterans into the education field, to work as paraprofessionals and participate in integrated, relevant academic study. Two-year and four-year college degrees were often earned through the program as well as teacher certification. Some courses were offered on the school site for cooperating teachers as well as

COP participants.[17]

Community involvement was integral, as community members both participated as trainees and served on COP councils. These councils were the vehicle through which community members had input into program policy and decision making. Like TTT, COP was organized under the theory of parity where community, school, and university would work together for the attainment of programmatic goals.

During its seven-year life span, COP trained approximately 14,000 participants, spending a total of $129,390,000.[18] Although it outlasted several of its sister programs in EPDA, COP, too, fell victim to the changing political climate of the 1970's.

> It was still possible in 1969 and 1970 to harness some responsible minority energies for the likes of a COP program. And, in its own fashion, COP started out as a refreshingly anti-bureaucratic exercise. But even then our national interest in education was beginning to slip, a trend the Nixon Administration was pleased to encourage. A perfectly good arrangement like COP simply needed much more push than it got. It just wasn't in the American educational power structure. Its rhetoric was quickly outdated.[19]

Urban/Rural School Development Program

The Urban Rural School Development Program was funded from 1971 until the Education Professions Development Act expired at the end of fiscal year 1976. The aim of the program was to improve educational opportunities of low income students through the training and retraining of educational personnel. Training programs were conducted "on site" wherever possible and were developed by university faculty or other qualified personnel in response to a needs assessment conducted locally.[20] Community input into project training activities was significant, as with other EPDA programs.

> In order that appropriate training programs be provided, emphasis was placed upon the development within the school and community of continuous processes for identifying critical needs and assembling

ideas, resources, and strategies to meet those needs, and upon the development of improved decision-making capabilities in school and community personnel.[21]

The governance of an urban/rural project was unique. Community participation on a parity basis with local education agency personnel was required. A school-community council was formed to serve as the planning/decision-making body for the project. Program staff were answerable directly to the council.[22]

Technical assistance and overall management of the Urban/Rural Project was provided by the Leadership Training Institute operated out of Stanford University.[23] At its height in 1972, the program had an appropriation of just under $12 million. This dollar amount decreased with each successive year until the program expired in fiscal year 1977.[24]

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Teacher Corps

The Teacher Corps has a tripartite focus: (1) the improving of education of children of low income families, (2) the encouraging of colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher training, and (3) the encouraging of institutions of higher education (IHE) and local education agencies (LEA) to improve programs of training and retraining for educational personnel.[25] While other training programs such as COP or TTT were phased out, Teacher Corps survived the dissolution of EPDA. It has retained a funding level of $37.5 million since 1973.[26] One reason for the program's longevity has been its ability to respond to fluctuations in the teaching market and to respond to research findings on past and present efforts to improve low income schools. This responsiveness has caused the program to

undergo several major changes since its 1965 inception.

Originally, Teacher Corps focused on training undergraduate interns to become teachers. A unique two-year program was developed in which interns combined on-site field experience in the schools with college coursework. The program sought to attract young people to fill teacher shortages and to initiate change in the schools.[27]

In the years that followed, it became evident that a more sophisticated approach to school change was needed. In addition, by the early seventies, it was clear that the teacher shortage no longer existed. Rather, a surplus of teachers flooded the education market. Several changes were made in the Teacher Corps legislation. One provision called for the attracting and training of volunteers, often parents, to serve as part-time tutors and aides in the schools. Another provision extended the authority of the program to include a focus on the preparation of education personnel to work with juvenile delinquents and youth offenders.[28]

In the fall of 1974, however, the scope of the program was broadened by the enforcement of new regulations which called for "demonstration projects for retraining experienced teachers and teacher aides serving in local education agencies."[29] The institution of higher education and the community collaborated to develop strategies for the improvement of the school climate and the training and retraining of educational personnel. Planning and governance were shared by these three groups. While pre-service training was still provided for in the legislation, the focus had shifted to in-service education. An integration of pre-service and in-service training at the school site was encouraged. In addition, the testing, institutionalization, and dissemination of educational reforms were emphasized to insure that

projects would continue to have impact after the funding cycle was completed.

Major legislative changes again occurred in 1976 which altered the design and focus of the program. Beginning with 1978, projects have been funded for five years rather than two. The Teacher Corps legislation requires that projects address the following four major outcomes: the improvement of school climate, the improvement of education personnel development systems at both the IHE and the LEA, the institutionalization of educational innovations developed during the project, and the dissemination of these products and practices to other education agencies. Planning is based upon an extensive needs assessment. The role of the community has been institutionalized through the provision for the election of a community council. The chairman of the community council serves on the governing Policy Board with the dean of the participating IHE department of education and the superintendent of the LEA. The Policy Board structure represents an unprecedented formalizing of the parity concept. The projects continue to focus on in-service education, although the training of four graduate interns is still integrated into the educational development systems.[30] Teacher Corps projects span the country and work with diverse low income populations, including rural, urban, bilingual, and Native American school children. Eighty projects were funded in 1978, fifty-one in 1979, with the total number decreasing each year.

Throughout its existence, the Teacher Corps has remained on the vanguard of educational reform. Efforts to improve school climate have included emphases on multicultural education, diagnostic-prescriptive education, bilingual education, team teaching, individualized instruction, competency-based education, and community-based education. The youth advocacy and exceptional child components continue to have impact by encouraging the

development of programs for youth offenders, the handicapped, and gifted and talented children. Teacher Corps has spurred the development and institutionalization of new and better ways to prepare and retrain educators. Finally, it has promoted field-based training and the practical application of research to insure that theoretical developments are utilized and tested in school improvement efforts.

Teachers Centers

The purpose of the Teacher Centers program is to support curriculum development and training of educational personnel, primarily teachers, at the local level. The Teacher Center is most often situated in a school district building, but it can be a changing location; it is more a concept than a specific site. The Teacher Center concept is one of teacher-planned and teacher-operated training, geared to specific on-site needs.

Training offered at Teacher Centers is designed to:

(1) Enable the teachers to better meet the special education needs of the students they serve (including training to enable teachers to implement effectively specific curricula); and

(2) Familiarize the teachers with developments in curriculum and educational research, including the use of research to improve teaching skills.[31]

Curriculum development by teachers at supported centers is intended to meet the needs of the students they serve. In addition, Teacher Centers provide the opportunity for the development of curricula based upon research findings or improved and new practices.

A maximum of ten percent of the grant money is allocated to institutions of higher education (IHE) for the operation of Teacher Centers.[32] The large majority of the monies are distributed to the local education development and

implementation of the Centers. In the remainder of the projects, the Center is run completely on the local level. State Education Agencies receive a portion of Teacher Center monies to fund the review and recommendation of grant applications and the providing of technical assistance and information dissemination. All Teacher Centers are governed by a policy board composed of a majority of classroom teachers, several administrators, and at least one representative of an institution of higher education.[33]

The Teacher Center idea, although only recently transformed into legislation, is not a new one. At the grassroots level, workplaces where teachers come together to work on curriculum or engage in staff development activities existed for some time. By 1974, it has been estimated, approximately 600 of these entities were in operation throughout the country.[34]

On the federal level, Teacher Centers were to have been the cornerstone of the grand design developed in the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (BPED) entitled "Educational Renewal".

> It was seen as the "nerve center" which would orchestrate the many diverse programs that would be brought together under Renewal. The center would provide a wide range of resources for training personnel on all levels, focusing on the trainees' pressing instructional problems, and affording an opportunity for participants to share experiences with one another.[35]

In addition seven "micro-pilot" training complexes with either teacher center structures or a curriculum development focus which was relevant to implementation in a teacher center, were sponsored by TTT. With the demise of EPDA, the teacher center idea did not disappear but re-emerged as a pilot program located at four sites across the country.[36] Finally, in 1976, the Teacher Centers program became law, and in 1978 it began its first operational year. During that year, the $8.25 million appropriations were used to fund

sixty-one projects. In fiscal year 1979, the budget increased to $12.65 million to allow for the continuation of these projects as well as the funding of an additional 25-30 new projects.[37]

AID TO POPULATIONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Title I

Title I was established in 1965 as a cornerstone of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A major program of President Johnson's "Great Society", it represented, and continues to be, the largest federal program in education. Over $2 billion was spent on this program in the 1978 school year to service more than 5 million school children in over 14,000 school districts. During that year, approximately ninety percent of the nation's school districts ran Title I programs.[38] In 1979, the total Title I appropriations, including grants to states, exceeded $3 billion.[39]

Title I provides monies to improve the quality of education for "educationally deprived" children who live in an attendance area with an above average concentration of low-income families. In addition, it makes mention of the special needs of Indian, handicapped, migrant, and neglected and delinquent children for which it also provides assistance.[40]

Title I funds are most often used to develop remedial programs in language arts, reading, and mathematics for children who are below grade level, to hire additional staff to teach in these programs, to provide more individual instruction, to fund summer programs for underachievers, and to fund in-service training for parents, teachers, and aides. The law requires that training for aides will be funded only "...if it has in effect well-developed plans providing for coordinated programs of training in which education aides,

including volunteers, and the professional staff whom they are assisting will participate together."[41] In addition, each project must establish and train a Parent Advisory Council to provide community input into the operation of the project.

Head Start

Head Start was established in 1964 to provide children from low income families with a comprehensive program to meet their educational, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs. Begun as an eight-week summer program, it was hoped that it would help 3-5-year-olds get a "head start" which would help them to be successful students once they reached school age.[42] The program has grown from an eight-week session to a year-round operation, and from a $96.4 million appropriation in 1965 to $454 million in 1976.[43] It is administered by the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF).

Head Start has always stressed the importance of training for its participants. Head Start Supplementary Training is made available to both professional and non-professional staff to promote increased knowledge in job-related areas. College credit as well as degrees are often earned. Parents are given preference for employment in the non-professional positions such as teacher aides and social service aides, cooks, storytellers, and supervisors of play activities.[44] Supplementary training is made available to them to increase their skills and allow for career development.

Projects are encouraged to provide for this training themselves. However, more staff development, particularly for non-professionals, has been channeled through the Child Development Associate Program. CDA is also administered by ACYF. It provides competency-based training to Head Start and day care center

personnel, leading to the awarding of a credential in child development.

> A Child Development Associate, or CDA, is a person able to meet the specific needs of a group of pre-school children in a child development setting by nurturing the children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual growth; by establishing and maintaining a proper child care environment; and by promoting good relations between parents and the child development center. The CDA is a person who has been awarded the CDA credential after satisfactorily demonstrating competence in his/her performance with children.[45]

Begun in 1973 as a pilot program at thirteen sites, CDA now operates through 350 colleges and universities and trains more than 4,000 Head Start classroom staff annually.[46] The training involves an integration of both academic and field work which is both flexible and individualized to cater to each candidate's needs, strengths, and time constraints. Traveling field supervisors are employed to oversee the field-based portion of the training. Applicants must be at least sixteen years of age and have worked in a child care setting for approximately one year. Previous formal training is not required.[47] After a two-year training period, the applicant is assessed by a review team. After a positive evaluation, the applicant is awarded a CDA credential. In addition to the credential, many CDAs are able to earn college credits or degrees through their participation in the program.[48]

Follow Through

The Follow Through program began operation in 1967. It was designed to provide continued assistance to low-income children who had been in Head Start or other pre-school programs. Although originally conceived as an operational program that would provide services to a large number of children, lack of funds forced the re-orientation of the program to a research and development approach. Appropriations reached a high of $70 million in 1971, more recently, appropriations have fallen somewhat lower.[49]

Each program has three elements: educational innovation, comprehensive services, and parent/community involvement. The approximately twenty sponsor institutions, either universities, educational laboratories, or private non-profit educational development firms subscribe to the Follow Through concept of "planned variation". Each has developed an integrated research-based model for improving the learning process which emphasizes one or more of the following: child centered education, use of curriculum packages, rearrangement of the learning environment, and improvement of the home educational environment.[50] A Follow Through site school selects the sponsor whose approach it feels best suits the needs of that school. Second, comprehensive services are provided for children, just as in Head Start, in areas such as physical and mental health, nutrition, and social services, "...to help children and their families cope with non-instructional problems which may interfere with educational growth."[51] Third, parent and community members participate in Follow Through programs as both aides and decision-makers.

Staff development plays a crucial role in the program. Training is the principle means by which sponsors impart their instructional approach to the site schools. Through workshops, demonstrations, and local training efforts, the sponsor's model is taught to site staff and parents.[52] In the past, a special focus was placed on the training and advancement of low-income paraprofessionals through the Follow Through Supplementary Training Program. The program paid for college courses which enabled these aides to earn degrees in job-related areas. Due to lack of funds, however, Supplementary Training has been phased out, with no new enrollees permitted since 1973.[53] Nevertheless, every site must have a career development plan which puts

priority on the hiring, counseling and training of parents and low income paraprofessionals, who must be provided with the opportunity to advance in salary and job responsibility.[54]

Civil Rights Training and Advisory Services

Authorized in 1964, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act provides funds for technical assistance and training of educational personnel in the area of public school desegregation. Federal funds are used to assist educators in the development and implementation of desegregation plans and to aid them in meeting educational needs which stem from the desegregation process.

Monies are allocated in several different ways. Over twenty-five General Assistance Centers (GAC) have been established throughout the country to provide technical assistance to desegregating LEAs. GACs are usually funded through IHEs who service several school systems in the region. SEAs also receive funding to provide technical assistance to LEAs in the planning, adopting and implementing of desegregation plans. Grants for training institutes are funded at IHEs to provide training to educational personnel in the school desegregation process. Finally, direct grants are given to LEAs who demonstrate exceptional need for assistance in dealing with desegregatin problems.[55] This money is also used to support curriculum development in these schools. Approximately seventy-five percent of the funds are used for paying advisory specialists and to provide for in-service training of educational personnel.[56]

Funds are also allocated under this Act to accommodate problems associated with discrimination against American children who do not speak English, as highlighted in *Lau vs. Nichols* Supreme Court decision. In this case, the court ruled that schools must make efforts to facilitate the "effective

participation" in educational programs by students with language deficiencies resulting from environments in which the dominant language is other than English.[57] In addition to bilingual programs, the Act also includes provisions for assistance in the areas of sex discrimination and sex desegregation as called for by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.[58]

Fiscal support for the program has varied. In the early seventies, appropriations dropped to a low of $14,000,000. Since 1973, however, with the focusing of desegregation efforts on Northern cities, there has been a slow but steady gain in the money allocated to the program.[59]

Emergency School Aid Act

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) aims to "...eliminate or prevent minority group isolation and to improve the quality of education of all children."[60] Federal financial assistance for desegregation efforts originated with the authorization of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The passage of the Emergency School Assistance Program in 1970 gave additional support by concentrating existing Federal Discretionary activities in this area. The Emergency School Aid Act of 1972 replaced this program.[61]

The act provides supplemental funds to desegregating LEAs for three purposes:

1. To meet the special needs incidental to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools.
2. To encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.
3. To help school children overcome the disadvantages of minority group isolation.[62]

Approximately twenty-percent of ESAA funds are used for professional

development of educational personnel. Grants are given to LEAs to provide staff training that is directly related to the assessed educational needs of students in desegregating schools. The primary focus of ESAA is the student; training of educational personnel is secondary.[63]

Bilingual Education

Through both legislative and judicial action, bilingual education has grown to be a prevalent force in American education.

In January 1968, the Federal Bilingual Education Act was signed into law:

> The Congress hereby finds that one of the most acute educational problems in the United States is that which involves millions of children of limited English-speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than English....[64]

In *Lau vs. Nichols*, the Supreme Court directed the San Francisco Unified School district to provide its Chinese-speaking students with instruction appropriate to their language proficiency. This and subsequent decisions established bilingial education as a legal right; school districts not providing instruction to meet the needs of limited English-speaking students could lose their federal funding.[65]

Bilingual education has always been a highly controversial issue. Opponents of the concept insist that today's non-English speaking students, like yesterday's immigrants, should be taught only in English, the dominant language of the United States. This argument, however, ignores the unique circumstances under which many of these children have become residents of the United States.

> The argument speaks only to immigrants who chose to come to and become part of the "mainstream" of the United States and the English-speaking majority. However, historically there have been other groups of non-English speakers who have become part of the U.S. society as a result of land acquisitions and/or war reparation. These include all American Indians, the French-speaking

> Cajun population in Louisiana; the Spanish-speaking residents of the territory acquired by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and the Gadsden Purchase; the Chinese transported for labor in the railroad-building era; the Aleutian Eskimo and Indian language users residing in Alaska; the Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans annexed by the Treaty of P[illegible]s of 1901; and the Cubans admitted after Castro; and more recently Vietnamese refugees.[66]

In addition, this argument denies the basic right of these children to their own cultural identity by insisting upon the antiquated "melting pot" theory of assimilation into the American culture. The Bilingual Education Act falls under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The act was designed to meet the needs of an estimated 7.7 million low income children between the ages of three and eighteen who are at a disadvantage in most American schools because their mother tongue is not English.[67] It promotes the teaching of the children in both English and the language they speak in their homes. This bilingual approach is complemented by lessons about the children's ethnic and cultural heritage as well as the cultures of other peoples of the United States. Funding levels for the program have climbed steadily, often by $15-20 million a year, since the first appropriation of $7.5 million in 1969; the appropriation for fiscal year 1979 was $150 million.[68]

The teacher training component of Title VII is a vital part of the legislation. As a witness testified at a congressional hearing on the bilingual education law:

> If we continue to direct our efforts (and funds) to the establishment of bilingual programs without assurance of prior and proper teacher and teacher-aide training, we are condemning our program to mediocrity at best.[69]

In 1974, the law was amended to attempt to remedy the acknowledged shortage of teachers trained in bilingual methods. As of fiscal year 1978, approximately one third of the total appropriations were allocated to train an estimated

36,000 educational professionals.[70] These funds are earmarked for several different types of training activities:

---In-service and pre-service training leading to certification or advanced degrees in bilingual education.

---Resource centers that provide technical assistance and inservice activities for school bilingual personnel. In 1977, there were fourteen such resource centers in existence.

---Allocations to IHEs to develop programs in bilingual education. The money is used to buy initial resources, fund staff positions, develop courses, and pay stipends for participants, with the understanding that the institution will take over the responsibility for underwriting the program when federal dollars are withdrawn.

---Graduate fellowships to support teachers who wish to advance their knowledge and effectiveness as bilingual educators.[71]

Indo-China Refugee Children Assistance Act

Enacted in 1976, the Indo-China Refugee Children Assistance Act is designed to provide supplementary educational services to refugee children. These services include English language and bilingual instruction and the provision of special materials and supplies. The act specifically funds "special in-service training for personnel who will be providing instruction."[72]

Indian Education Act

The Indian Education Act was passed in 1972 in an attempt to address the educational needs of Native American school children and adults. It authorizes payments to LEAs which serve Indian pupils to enable the often impoverished school districts to develop special programs for these children. Funding is also provided for adult education, primarily in the area of literacy and high school equivalency, and for planning, pilot, and demonstration projects.[73]

RECENT FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Funding for the training of teachers of Indian children was originally provided under the Education Personnel Development Act (EPDA).[74] In 1974 this responsibility was transferred to Part B of the Indian Education Act, Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children.[75] Of the total fiscal year 1978 allocation of approximately $55 million, about six-percent of the funds were devoted to the development of pre-service and in-service training programs for teachers, aides, social workers, administrators, and other school personnel who work with Native American children.[76] Strict guidelines as to how the money is to be spent for professional development are not specified at the federal level. Rather, training designs are based on assessed needs and are locally determined. In keeping with a policy of Indian self-determination, community and parental involvement is required in training programs, as with all Indian Education projects.[77] Some programs funded include internship positions and the sponsoring of the education of students enrolled in colleges to become teachers or teacher aides. Preference is given to funding the training of Indians to teach Indian children.[78]

Part A of the Indian Education Act, Payments to Local Education Agencies for Indian Education, provides a small percentage of its funds for teacher training.[79] Professional development of educational personnel is also supported under Part C, Special Programs for Adult Indians.[80]

Gifted and Talented

This act is designed to meet the special educational needs of the country's gifted and talented children; "The nation's greatest resource for solving critical national problems."[80] Grants are given to state and local education agencies for the development, operation, improvement, and dissemination of

educational programs for the gifted and talented. Both state education agencies and institutions of higher education may apply for money to support the training of educational personnel to work with and to develop programs for the gifted and talented. Funds are provided for both pre-service and in-service training.[81] Personnel development grants to institutions of higher education are specifically earmarked for the training of leadership personnel including teacher trainees, school administrators, supervisors, researchers, and state consultants and may be used for interships with local, state, or federal agencies or other public or private organizations.[82] First authorized under the Education Amendments of 1974, the act was funded steadily below $3 million until 1979 when the appropriation rose to $3.78 million.[83]

Education of the Handicapped

Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, represents a significant redefinition of the federal role in the education of the handicapped, a role which requires an increase in both the numbers and expertise of educational personnel. The law states that *all* handicapped children have the right to a free and appropriate public education and that this education must be provided in the "least restrictive environment consistent with their needs and abilities."[84] Thus, many handicapped children are being "mainstreamed" into the regular classroom where the teacher must be prepared to address their special needs as well as to carry out his or her usual duties. Furthermore, the law specifies that an individualized education program (I.E.P.) must be developed for each handicapped child, an activity in which many teachers have now become involved.[85] In view of the newness of the legislation, few teachers have received the pre-service training necessary to enable them to develop I.E.P.'s and to work with the handicapped. Thus, a

significant retraining effort is needed if the goals of PL 94-142 are to be met.

In addition, the provision that the previously unserved and the most severely handicapped have priority to receive educational services means that greater numbers of highly trained specialists are needed to work in the education system.[86] It was estimated in 1976 that at least 200,000 more teachers and support personnel would be needed to fulfill the PL 94-142 regulations. This was 170,000 more than were receiving training at the time.[87]

Congress has passed several bills in an attempt to meet the demand for educational personnel development in the field of education for the handicapped. The Special Education Manpower Development Act, and the Recruitment and Information Act both address the acute personnel shortages directly. A majority of the other handicapped education programs contain provisions for the training of educational personnel. Legislated under the PL 91-230, Title VI, these programs are Regional Resource Centers, Deaf-Blind Centers, Early Childhood Education, Severely Handicapped Projects, Innovation and Development, and Specific Learning Disabilities. A description of each of these programs follows.

Special Education Manpower Development

This legislation is devoted solely to the development of an adequate supply of trained personnel to meet the educational needs of handicapped children. .Grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, state and local education agencies, and other non-profit organizations. A wide spectrum of professionals receive training under the provisions of the act; training is not limited to persons with a background in education. Personnel receiving

instruction include teachers, administrators, supervisors, speech pathologists, audiologists, specialists in physical education and recreation, teacher educators, vocational and career educators, paraprofessionals, and volunteers.[88]

Several programs focus on the preparation and continued education of special educators, thus both pre-service and in-service training is funded. Financial assistance is provided to allow teachers to receive training in working with exceptional children. Funds also support the training of specialists in areas such as pre-school handicapped, multi-handicapped, and vocational and career education for the handicapped.[89] In addition, the act funds programs which provide training to regular classroom teachers who, due to PL 94-142, are increasingly encountering handicapped children who have been mainstreamed into their classrooms. This training emphasizes teaching methodologies, classroom management, and utilization of support service personnel.[90]

While appropriations to the Special Education Manpower Development Act have hardly approached a level which would enable funding of all needed training, they have spurred the development of programs which begin to meet the personnel shortage. A recent increase in funding from $43,375 million in fiscal year 1978 to $57,687 million in fiscal year 1979 is an indication that the critical needs in this area are recognized and being responded to by Congress and by the Department of Education.[91]

Regional Resource Centers

Regional Resource Centers have been established to identify, demonstrate, and disseminate model programs for the education of handicapped children.[92] They are not intended to offer direct services, but rather to provide

necessary diagnostic prescriptive services.[93] Training of education personnel is a key responsibility of these centers. In addition to providing instruction in methods for implementing approrpriate services for the handicapped learner, the centers provide technical assistance in such areas as child evaluation, needs analysis, strategy development, and monitoring and tracking systems.[94]

Deaf-Blind Centers

Ten regional model centers have been established to coordinate and develop programs directed at educating deaf-blind children, to enable them to learn to communicate and to become participating members of society.[95] The regional centers subcontract to over 250 facilities where these children are in attendence and are responsible for technical assistance and monitoring activities.[96] In-service training of personnel at the subcontract organizations is provided for under the act. Other funded services include medical diagnosis, educational evaluation, family counseling, and dissemination of information on methodologies, materials, curriculum, and proceedings of workshops and training services.[97]

It should be noted that an acute shortage of personnel qualified to work with children who are both deaf and blind has hampered efforts to improve services offered to these children. It is estimated that an additional 500 to 600 teachers are needed to adquately address the needs of deaf-blind children. Far fewer, approximately forty to fifty, teachers are currently being trained in this area.[98]

Innovation and Development

Grants are awarded to states, institutions of higher education, and other public or private research facilities to "improve the effectiveness and

efficiency of the eduational system and its provisions for handicapped children."[99] New service models are developed, validated, and disseminated, and information is packaged and systemically distributed. Research and development activities are funded which support the total federal program effort for handicapped children. The consideration of educational personnel development is integrated into the models which are developed and disseminated under this legislation.[100]

Specific Learning Disabilities

The Specific Learning Disabilities program seeks to improve educational services offered to an estimated 1,960,000 learning disabled children.[101] Funds are provided to support model programs, technical assistance, research, and training activities. There is a need to develop programs in this area as, even by the most conservative estimates, no more than twenty-five percent of children with learning disabilities, such as dyslexia, minimal brain dysfunction, central nervous system dysfunction, or minimal aphasia, are receiving appropriate educational remediation.[102]

A majority of the demonstration programs emphasize the training of regular classroom teachers, specialized personnel, administrators, and paraprofessionals in diagnostic prescriptive techniques.[103] The legislation calls for the funding of

> ...professional or advanced training for educational personnel who are teaching or are preparing to be teachers of children with specific learning disabilities, or such training for persons who are, or are preparing to be supervisors and teachers of such personnel....[104]

Other practices funded under the Specific Learning Disabilities program include training of parents, screening programs for early identification of learning disabilities, and dissemination of information about the efforts

being made for learning disabled children.[105]

Early Childhood Education

This act provides for the coordination, demonstration, and dissemination of model programs designed to improve the services provided to the pre-school handicapped (birth through eight years of age). Inservice training for professional as well as volunteers and paraprofessionals is one of several activities funded under this act. Training, counseling, and other forms of support are also provided to parents of the preschool handicapped.[106]

Severely Handicapped Projects

First funded in 1974, Severely Handicapped Projects are designed to meet the dearth of information on the educational needs and methodologies associated with the severely handicapped and to enable these children to become as self-sufficient as possible.[107] Model demonstration projects are funded throughout the country to develop and refine screening procedures, diagnostic and prescription methodologies, curriculum packages, and to disseminate successful products and practices.[108]

Approximately ten percent of total funds are expended on professional development of educational personnel.[109] Several projects have been specifically funded to perform outreach activities for the training of educational personnel in their respective regions.[110] In addition, all projects focus on developing new and better methods for training educational personnel to work with severely handicapped children.

> A typical model demonstration project developed under this program would be able to identify and diagnose the particular needs of severely handicapped children and provide counseling services to parents and teachers as well as appropriate direct education and training services. It would also include inservice training and curriculum development and would be suitable for replication in other communities if successful.[111]

VOCATIONAL, ADULT, AND CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Vocational Education

The first vocational education law was passed by Congress in 1917. Since then, the field has received continual federal support and represents one of the major Department of Education expenditures largely through formula grants to states. These grants support a wide range of programs in secondary, post-secondary, and adult vocational education. Areas covered include: consumer and homemaking, trades and industry, office occupations, distribution, agricultural production, and health.[112]

Vocational Education continues to experience a shortage of educational personnel. Three programs have been established to promote the training of vocational education teachers: Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program, Vocational Education Personnel Development, and Research and Training.

Vocational Education Personnel Development

Two programs for the training of personnel in vocational education are authorized under this law. The Vocational Education Graduate Leadership Development Program provides money to fund the studies of individuals at colleges and universities. The individuals apply directly to the Department of Education program and designate the college(s) of their choice. Awards are then made to the selected candidates' institutions and stipends are provided to fund their graduate training.[113] The program is designed to encourage the development of much-needed leadership in the vocational education field. The second program, the Vocational Education Teacher Certification Program, is designed to recertify teachers. Persons from other fields such as business,

industry, or agriculture can also obtain certification under this program. Funding, as with the Leadership Development Program, is distributed in the form of stipends and grants to the institutions offering the training.[114]

In earlier years, Vocational Education Personnel Development supported a wider variety of efforts and was funded at a higher level. States were allocated funds to improve their programs in vocational education through short-term training of guidance counselors, vocational coordinators, and teachers. This training emphasized competency-based modules, individualized occupational internships, and the integration of career education into the curriculum. Efforts funded by the program also focused on regional coordination and on the needs of specific groups such as minorities, Native Americans, and children attending inner city schools.[115] The fiscal year 1978 budget, however, no longer provided funds for these activities. The 1978 appropriation was $3.5 million as compared to $10 million in fiscal year 1976.[116]

Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program

The purpose of the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program is:

> to provide training programs to meet the critical shortage of instructors possessing both the job knowledge and skills and the dual language capabilities required for adequate instruction of persons handicapped by their limited English-speaking ability.[117]

Approximately $700,000 was available in fiscal year 1979 to fund three projects which trained 130 teachers. These projects covered a wide range of areas including vocational counseling, chef preparation, clerical, mechanical, and graphic arts, accounting, and construction skills. Chinese, Spanish, and Sioux-Dakota were the languages spoken by participants.[118]

Research and Training

Funds under this program are administered for four major purposes: pilot programs to meet the special needs of youth (particularly disadvantaged youth), demonstration and dissemination projects, establishment and operation of State Research Coordinating Units, and training programs to familiarize personnel with new developments in the field.[119] In fiscal year 1978 the program was consolidated into Vocational Education Improvement Projects, which was funded under P.L. 94-482, Part B, Support 2.[120]

Adult Education

The purpose of the Adult Education Act is to eliminate functional illiteracy among adults, to enable all adults to continue their education, at least through the secondary level, and to make training opportunities available that will enable them "...to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens."[121] The leglislation is intended to serve all adults; however, special mention is made of the following groups: native Americans, limited English speakers, elderly Americans, institutionalized adults, Indo-Chinese refugees, and other immigrants.[122] Money is allocated through state education agencies. The states are required to spend at least ten percent of adult education funds on special projects, research and "...training persons engaged, or preparing to engage, as personnel in programs designed to carry out the purposes of this (adult education) title."[123]

Career Education

Career education burst upon the federal scene in 1970 with the appointment of Sidney Marland, a major proponent of the concept, as Commissioner of Education. From 1971-1974, career education was supported by discretionary monies from other programs. While approximately seventy percent of these

funds were drawn from vocational education, "...virtually all major components of the Office of Education were in realistic, budgetary terms, engaged in the career education priority."[124] During these years, a rationale for the federal role in career education was developed and a statement of program plans and objectives was written. This statement included references to staff development and pre-service and in-service teacher training.[125] In 1975, for the first time, career education became a budgetary line item with an appropriation of $10 million.

The Career Education Demonstration Program adopted the policy that "...each State and Local Education Agency should offer programs of career education which provide a wide variety of options designed to prepare each child for a maximum employment and participation."[126] Over half of grant monies were awarded to improve career education in grades K-12 and in community colleges, and adult and community education agencies. The remainder of programs funded include the development of state plans for career education, career education for special segments of the population such as handicapped, minority, and low income youths and to reduce sex stereotyping in career choices. Approximately ten percent of the appropriations were devoted to providing training and retraining of education personnel to conduct career education programs.[127] Demonstration programs were also established in which new methods of pre-service and in-service career education were developed, tested, and disseminated.

Library Career Training

The Library Career Training program emphasizes the recruitment and training of library professionals and paraprofessionals, focusing particularly on increasing the number of minorities working in the profession. This effort

has allowed higher percentages of Spanish-speaking, Native American, Asian American, and Black men and women to become trained to work in all types of libraries.[128] The program also provides funds for the retraining of library personnel in new areas of the field, and for training in "...establishing, developing, or exanding programs of library and information science."[129]

Training is offered in a variety of ways. Colleges and universities are funded to conduct short- and long-term institutes which focus on retraining or recruitment needs. At least fifty percent of program funds are used to support academic fellowships for persons pursuing advanced degrees in library science which will enable them to assume positions in library supervision, administration, and leadership.[130] These fellowships are intended to sponsor the entrance of larger numbers of minorities, including women, to higher level management positions.

Support for this program has declined from a high of $8.25 million appropriated in 1968 and 1969 to $2 million in 1977 and 1978.[131]

Library Demonstration and Research

Programs are funded under this act to improve libraries and training in librarianship. Funding is authorized to support "...the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information, and for the dissemination of information derived from such research."[132] Projects are also funded which focus on the improvement of education and training of library and information personnel.[133] Priority is accorded to those demonstration projects which are directed toward "...providing better access to information for economically or educationally disadvantaged persons."[134]

As with the Library Career Training program, appropriations for this

program have declined since the late sixties. From 1974 thru 1978, $1 million was appropriated, while in 1967 and 1968, $3.55 million was spent on Library Demonstration and Research.[135]

Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

Funds are provided under this act to:

> ...stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs and to serve as models for regular school programs and to assist the states in establishing and maintaining programs of testing and guidance and counseling.[136]

Many states have chosen to follow the former directive and have developed innovative programs in such areas as elementary guidance, career education, and in-service training of guidance and counseling personnel. Grants have encouraged the development of methods and techniques, group techniques, and leadership activities.[137]

OTHER PROGRAMS WITH TRAINING COMPONENTS

Right to Read

The Right to Read program was established in 1971 as a "...national effort for developing and improving the reading skills of all citizens, enabling each to function effectively in our society."[138] Right to Read has approached the goal of functional literacy for all citizens through promoting a cooperative effort with the state education agencies to administer and fund reading programs at the state and local level.

RECENT FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

While not specifically addressed to educational personnel development, Right to Read supports training of educational professionals through several programs. State Leadership and Training Programs have as one of their tasks the implementing of training programs for local Right to Read administrators and instructional personnel.

> The training program includes the teaching of basic reading skills, the preparation of administrative support materials for reading programs, and the development of tutoring projects, appropriate bilingual methods, and interpersonal relations skills.[139]

The Reading Academies program provides instruction to adults and both in-school and out-of-school youth in reading skills. The program makes use of institutions and community facilities not traditionally involved in the providing of reading instruction. Many volunteers and tutors work at these centers and a portion of the Reading Academies' budget is devoted to the training of these personnel.[140] A third program which provides training is the Reading Improvement Projects, in which staff development is one component of a concentrated effort to develop and implement comprehensive reading programs for elementary and secondary children who are reading below grade level.[141]

Finally, several sets of training modules have been developed to assist in staff development. Seven modules have been produced for use in in-service and pre-service training in leadership skills and reading program development. Each module contains a trainer's manual, a participant's manual, and audiovisual support materials. Another series of modules have been developed to provide elementary school principals with training in reading leadership. In addition, a contract has been granted to "...refine the development and field testing of a model for assisting classroom teachers in solving instructional problems in reading."[142]

RECENT FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In 1978, responding to public controversy over the alleged failure of the nation's schools to impart the "basics" of reading, writing, and arithmetic, Congress passed the Basic Skills Improvement Act. This Act, Title II of the Enducation Amendments of 1978, authorized major changes in the Right to Read legislation, expanding its focus from reading improvement to the improvement of instruction "so that all children are able to master the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and effective communication both written and oral."[143] The new legislation continued the educational personnel development activities funded under the Right to Read legislation, but expanded them to include the entire array of basic skills. Its first operational year was fiscal year 1980.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act addresses the problems of drug and alcohol abuse among youth. It is primarily a demonstration and training program. The program is founded upon the notion that:

> The most successful drug abuse and prevention programs are those that take into account all the problems affecting young people and do not focus exclusively on drug abuse.[144]

The act funds the training of educators, counselors, public service professionals, and parents who must respond to alcohol and drug abuse problems and supports the demonstration, evaluation, and dissemination of effective strategies (including curricula) for drug abuse prevention. An estimated ninety-percent of the appropriations are spent on educational personnel development.[145]

Since 1972, the act has sponsored the training of over 3,000 school-community teams composed of principals, school psychologists, teachers, health educators, and social workers. These interdisciplinary teams are trained to

attack not only drug problems, but to dig deeper into underlying causes of narcotics abuse and to attempt to promote total school change. They attend a two-week training session in which team-building and organizational skills are taugnt including needs assessment, objectives formulation, resource identification, and evaluation. A second portion of the training provides a basic understanding of alcohol and narcotics. Teams return to their schools to work together to promote activities responsive to local needs. Examples of these activities include: drug counseling including peer counseling, alternatives and recreational programs, parent and community education, staff and teacher training, and information dissemination. These teams are trained and receive continued technical assistance from one of five regional centers.[146]

In earlier years, the program also had a pre-service component which prepared future educational personnel to respond to the alchohol and drug related problems of adolescents. From 1974 to 1977, six colleges received funding as demonstration projects to develop and validate new methods of pre-service training in this area. In addition, a series of conferences were held in 1973 and 1974 to provide 180 colleges of education with skills and program planning training to enable them to develop pre-service programs in drug and alcohol abuse prevention.[147] The philosophy behind the pre-service training program is a humanistic one in which teacher trainees are taught to relate to students as people.

> The strategy is to treat prospective teachers as individuals whose unique interests, capabilities, and aspirations are respected, supported, and strengthened. If young teachers-to-be experience this kind of caring, personalized, human education themselves, the assumption is they will be best equipped to provide the same kind of relationship and environment in their classrooms and schools.[148]

Although drug and alcohol abuse continue to be extremely problematic areas

in American education today, funding for this program has dropped significantly in recent years. The 1972 budget figure was $12.5 million as compared with two million dollars in the years 1976 through 1979.[149]

Community Education

While the federal program in community education is relatively new, the support of community education is not. For twenty years before the 1974 authorization of the Community Education Program, the C.S. Mott Foundation had been donating several million dollars a year to fund community education practitioners and projects. The concept itself was established more than four decades ago.[150]

Community education programs by definition serve and are responsive to unique local needs of the communities where they reside. The Community Education Program in the Office of Education has as some of its major goals:

> ...the development of better interaction between school and community, more effective use of community resources, and the development of new approaches to meet the educational, cultural, recreational, and social needs of local communities.[151]

Programs often utilize school facilities extending their function to accommodate classes and activities for non-school age citizens.

Grants are distributed to IHEs, LEAs, and SEAs. The latter use funds to develop and implement technical assistance to community education projects within the state. Major objectives include increasing the level of skills and awareness and increasing the number of community education projects. This is done through conferences, workshops, and individual consultations. Some SEAs also develop and disseminate curricula and training materials.[152] Grants to IHEs are devoted largely to training efforts of both LEA and SEA personnel. The development of community education competencies as well as other training

curricula and materials have also been funded.[153] Finally, the largest number of grant awards are made to LEAs to fund the establishment, maintenance, or expansion of community education programs.

Women's Educational Equity Act

The Women's Educational Equity Act seeks the establishment of equal educational opportunity for women in the United States. It's stated goals are:

1. The elimination of discrimination on the basis of sex and of those elements of sex role sterotyping and sex role socialization in educational institutions, programs, and curricula which prevent full and fair participation by women in educational programs and in American society generally.

2. The achievement of responsiveness by educational institutions, programs, curricula, policy makers, administrators, instructors, and other personnel to the needs, interests, and concerns of women arising from inequitable educational policies and practices.[154]

Originally funded at $6.27 million in 1976, the appropriations have risen by approximately 1 million dollars each subsequent year.[155] These monies support a wide spectrum of agencies and activities. Small grants, not to exceed $15,000, as well as larger grants which average about $95,000, are awarded to implement a "capacity building" strategy.[156] That is, projects are funded to develop models and products that can be adapted and adopted by other organizations. Among the priority areas for funding are modules on sexism in education, programs in career education, and programs in educational leadership. The latter provides for pre-service and in-service training for educational personnel, particularly in guidance and counseling.[157]

In 1978, twenty-eight of the program's 217 awards sponsored pre-service/in-service training projects. Examples of these projects include: a project employing a team training approach to effectively eliminate sex-bias

in schools, the development of a non-sexist teacher education curriculum by a school of education, the offering of workshops designed to attract and increase the number of women educational leaders, a project to reduce math anxiety among teacher education students, and a pre-service/in-service training program designed to promote educational equity through school libraries.[158]

The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program

The program provides assistance to public and private nonprofit educational agencies to enable them to develop, establish, and operate programs in ethnic heritage and multicultural awareness. Projects are intended to utilize the special knowledge of local groups as well as the expertise and research facilities of institutions of higher learning. Emphasis is placed on multi-ethnic endeavors which draw upon the cultural pluralism of the community. Each project has a strong community base and must be planned and implemented in consultation with an advisory council. The council contains both community members representative of the ethnic groups with which the project is concerned and educational professionals with expertise relevant to the project's focus.[159]

Grants are awarded in three main areas: curriculum development, dissemination, and training. Approximately fifty percent of program funds are devoted to the latter, with community members as well as teachers, curriculum specialists, trainers of teachers, and administrators serving as possible audiences for training. Sometimes credit is awarded toward in-service requirements or degrees. Training is always based upon an assessment of local needs and resources and may include the "...preparation of teacher manuals or guides in ethnic studies, revision of pre-service teacher education programs

or such in-service activities as workshop courses, institutes, and classroom demonstrations of methods and materials."[160] The wide range of projects funded under the heading of training is illustrated by the following sample of titles chosen from the 1977 and 1978 funding lists:

-- "Appalachian Studies: A Comparative Culture Approach"

-- "Ethnic Heritage School Board Training Project."

-- "Teaching for Cross Cultural Understanding"

-- "Training Older Adults as Peer Teachers in Ethnic Studies."

-- "In-service Teacher Training in Indo-Chinese Culture"

-- Cultural Diversity in Early Childhood Education: Teacher Training Project.

-- Ethnic Studies Project for School Librarians.[161]

Although originally authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program was not funded until 1974. Since that time its appropriations have hovered around the two million dollar mark.[162] Individual grants do not exceed $60,000. Monies for training grants are used to support academic consultants who provide training, tuition costs, and stipends, including dependents' allowances, to persons receiving training.[163]

Consumer Education

Under this act, grants are given to SEAs, LEAs, and other public or private non-profit agencies to promote the development of programs in consumer education. Money is used to identify, assess, and disseminate information on existing curricula in consumer education, to fund resource centers which provide technical assistance and information in this area, and to train service providers. Programs at elementary and secondary schools are

supported, as are community education programs in consumer education. Target populations include bilingual, Indian, low-income, correctional, elderly, and handicapped persons.[164]

> Projects are designed to prepare consumers for participating in the marketplace by imparting the understanding, attitudes, and skills which will enable persons to make rational and intelligent consumer decisions in the light of their personal values, their recognition of marketplace alternatives and social, economic, and ecological considerations.[165]

The consumer's role in regard to human service agencies, regulatory agencies, and public utilities is also addressed by some projects.

Originally authorized under the Education Amendments of 1972, Consumer Education Amendments of 1972, Consumer Education was not funded until fiscal year 1976 following its re-authorization under the Special Projects Act of 1974. The level of its appropriations has remained steadily between three and four million dollars.[166]

Funds are not specifically allocated to education personnel development; however, a portion is spent on pre-service and in-service training of teachers. In general, funds are directed toward "capacity building" by institutions and agencies. Thus, a large majority of the money is granted to provide training for service providers rather than to individual consumers. Over 26,500 providers have received training through the Consumer Education program, including regular classroom teachers, teachers of the handicapped, other educational personnel, staffs in pre-release mental hospitals and correctional institutions, Indian tribal personnel, professionals who work with senior citizens, and members of local police forces.[167] Among teacher training projects funded in 1978 were "Teacher Training in Consumer Survival," "Education for Youthful Offenders," "Consumer Education in Appalachia," "Seminars for Human Services Personnel," "Adult Basic Educators," "Teachers K-

12 Using Satellite Technology," and "Teaching and Re-enforcing Adult Survival Skills: A Modular Audio-Visual Approach." Approximately one quarter of the sixty projects funded had teacher training components.[168]

Arts in Education

Originally authorized in 1974, the Arts in Education Act is designed to promote the arts as an essential and integral part of elementary and secondary education. Grants are given to state and local education agencies to fulfill this purpose in a number of ways.

Teacher education is a stated goal of the program. State education agencies have received grants to sponsor state-wide teacher training activities. In addition, grants to local education agencies are devoted largely to the training of educational personnel and professional artists in arts education.[169] Artists or performers in residence are often sponsored to demonstrate particular art forms as well as to help in the planning and execution of dance, music, drama, or visual arts programs.[170] Monies are also used to support arts, educational planning, conferences, and mini-grants at the state level.

Environmental Education

The Environmental Education Act was passed in 1970 in response to growing concern about the deterioration of the quality of the nation's environment. Re-authorized in 1978, the act encourages the development of an increased understanding of environmental and ecological issues among the American public in the belief that this knowledge is crucial to the preservation of the environment.[171] The act encourages the development, evaluation, and dissemination of environmental instructional materials and curricula. Monies

provide for the development of programs in elementary and secondary schools as well as for community environmental education programs, workshops, and seminars for adults. In addition, the act makes funds available for educational personnel development in the area of environmental education.[172] It supports:

> ...pre-service and in-service training programs and projects (including fellowship programs, institutes, workshops, symposia, and seminars) for educational personnel to prepare them to teach in subject matter areas associated with environmental quality and ecology or to develop interdisciplinary strategies and programs of environmental quality and ecology.[173]

The training of government employees, public service personnel, business, labor, and industrial leaders and employees is also encouraged. For 1978, six of the fifty-four grantees, were funded to work in education personnel development. These projects include the training of elementary teachers in ecological and systems theory approaches, the training of school personnel in regional environment issues, and the training of high school teachers in the use of the case study approach to environmental education.[174]

Metric Education

The purpose of the Metric Education program is to enable students to learn how to use the metric system of measurement as part of the regular educational program. Three main approaches to metric education are funded under this law. Approximately twenty percent of the funding supports the training of teachers and teacher trainees in order to prepare them to teach the use of the metric system.[175] Money is provided for both pre-service and in-service training and dissemination of instructional materials, and the development or improvement of metric education curricula and programs. Target populations for these projects include Native Americans, bilingual, elderly, handicapped,

corrections students, parents and other adults as well as students in regular classrooms.[176] Grant recipients include IHEs, LEAs, SEAs and other public and private non-profit agencies.

Division of Educational Replication

The purpose of this program is to fund the National Diffusion Network (NDN). The NDN is a nationwide clearinghouse which provides information on proven educational innovations to meet the needs of teachers and the children they serve.[177] Approximately thirty percent of these funds are allocated to educational personnel development.[178] Networks between and among state and local education agencies and intermediate service agencies have been established to facilitate the search for an identification of needed educational practices and products. Once desired elements in the NDN have been selected, developer-demonstrators, who are made available through the program, are called in to provide the training and technical assistance necessary for the adoption of the new educational programs.[179]

In reviewing recent federal programs (1965 to the present) that have included educational personnel training, certain common elements can be seen. Among those are: training for teachers of target populations such as the economically disadvantaged, handicapped, bilingual, Native Americans, and other exceptional persons; a collaborative effort in the form of advisory boards, planning groups, and governance groups uniting communities, local education agencies, and institutions of higher education; development and dissemination of curricular reforms; and field-based instruction. Many innovative programs and practices which have been institutionalized over the past fifteen years would not have been possible without federal assistance.

FOOTNOTES

[1]George R. Kaplan, From Aide to Teacher Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977, pp. 34-35.

[2]Federal Register, "Education Professions Development", Vol. 39, No. 56 Part 174 Thursday, March 21, 1974, p. 10567.

[3]Ibid.

[4]U.S. Office of Education, Analysis of U.S. Office of Education Discretionary Programs Having a Professional Development of Education Component May, 1978, p.4.

[5]Kaplan, op.cit., p.9.

[6]U.S. Office of Education, Analysis of..., op.cit., p.6.

[7]Ibid., p.8.

[8]Malcom M. Provus, The Grand Experiment Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975, p.vi.

[9]Ibid., p.21.

[10]Ibid., p.70.

[11]Ibid., p.69-70.

[12]Ibid., p.3.

[13]Ibid., p.133.

[14]Ibid., p.3.

[15]Kaplan, op.cit., p.1.

[16]U.S. Office of Education, EPDA Program Manual (in-house document) December, 1972.

[17]Ibid., p.12.

[18]Kaplan, op.cit., p.4.

[19]Ibid., p. 117.

[20]U.S. Office of Education, Annual Evaluation, op. cit., p. 470-471.

[21]Ibid., p.471.

[22]U.S. Office of Education, Urban/Rural School Development Program

[23]U.S. Office of Education Annual Evaluation, op. cit., p.471.

[24]Ibid., p.470.

[25]Federal Register, "Teacher Corps Projects", Vol. 43, No. 37, Appendix, p. 7537, Thursday, Feb. 23, 1978.

[26]U.S. Office of Education, Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education, 1977, p.460

[27]U.S. Office of Education, Analysis of..., op. cit., p.34

[28]Ibid., p.35

[29]Ibid.

[30]Federal Register, "Teacher Corps Projects" op. cit., pp.7531-7533.

[31]Federal Register, "Teacher Centers Program," Vol. 43, No. 7 Wednesday, January 11, 1978, p.1765.

[32]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor and Senate Committee on Human Resources, A Compilation of Federal Education Laws, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977, p.450.

[33]Federal Register "Teacher Centers," op. cit. p.1765.

[34]Harry Bell and John Peightel, Teacher Centers and In-service Education Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, pamphlet #71, 1976.

[35]U.S. Office of Education, Commissioner's Report on the Education Professions 1975-76, Teacher Centers, U.S. Government Printing Office 1977,

p.13.

[36]Ibid., pp.5-17

[37]Education Daily, Vol. 12, No. 15, January 22, 1979, p.4

[38]U.S. Office of Education, Title I Questions and Answers, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

[39]Education Daily, op. cit., p.1.

[40]U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-561, Title I, - Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, November 1, 1978, Sec.101.

[41]Ibid., Sec. 124 (1)

[42]Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Head Start, A Child Development Program, 1976, p. 1

[43]Ibid., p.2.

[44]Ibid., p.6.

[45]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Human Development Services, The Child Development Associate, 1977. (Pamphlet)

[46]Ibid.

[47]Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development (now Administration for Children, Youth and Families), How to Become a Child Development Associate.

[48]Kirschner Associates, Inc., An Assessment of Head Start Supplementary Programs, Vol. 1: Executive Summary August, 1978.

[49]Nero and Associates, Follow Through, A Story of Educational Change June 1976, p.4.

[50]Ibid., p.10.

[51]Ibid., p.8.

[52]Ibid.

[53]U.S. Office of Education, Letter of Information on Follow Through, June 14, 1978.

[54]Nero and Associates, op. cit., p.13.

[55]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., p.19

[56]U.S.O.E., Analysis of..., op. cit., p.46.

[57]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., p.167

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid., p.166.

[60]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., p.20.

[61]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., p.158.

[62]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., p.20

[63]U.S.O.E., Analaysis of..., op. cit., pp.17 and 45

[64]U.S. Congress, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of 1965, as amended, Sec. 701.

[65]InterAmerica Research Associates, Third Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education November 1977, p.7

[66]Ibid. pp. 2-3.

[67]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., p.46.

[68]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., p.131, Education Daily op. cit., p.2.

[69]InterAmerica Research Associates, op. cit., p.A-6.

[70]U.S.O.E., Analysis of..., op. cit., p.17; U.S.O.E., Bilingual Education (pamphlet), 1978.

[71]U.S.O.E., Analysis of..., op. cit., p.44. and U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., pp.48-49

[72]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Senate and Labor..., op. cit., p.721

[73]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., p.51

[74]Ibid., pp. 1 and 58

[75]U.S.O.E., Analysis of..., op.cit., p.47.

[76]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner..., op. cit., p.51.

[77]U.S.O.E., Analysis of..., op. cit., p.47.

[78]Executive Office of the President, Office of Managment and Budget, Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976 No. $13.534, p.271.

[79]Ibid., #13.536, p.272.

[80]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., p.359.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid.

[83]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.31.

[84]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., p.387,

[85]Ibid., p.388.

[86]Ibid., p.389.

[87]Ibid., p.387 and Education Daily, op. cit.

[88]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.33.

[89]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation, op. cit., p.371.

[90]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.33

[91]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.374.

[92]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.32.

[93]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation, op. cit., p.375.

[94]Ibid., p.376.

[95]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., p.399.

[96]Ibid., p.395

[97]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.402

[98]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.43.

[99]Ibid., p.44.

[100]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, op. cit.,p.802.

[101]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.43.

[102]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., pp. 378-79.

[103]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.382.

[104]Ibid., p.383.

[105]U.S.O.E., Analaysis of...., op. cit., p.50.

[106]Ibid., p.51.

[107]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.3.

[108]U.S. Congress, Education Amendments of 1978, Sec. 901, p.158.

[109]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p. 529.

[110]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, and Senate Committee on Human Resources, op. cit., Sec. 404, p.533.

[111]U.S.O.E., Annual valuation...., op. cit., p.529 and Education Daily, op. cit., p.4.

[112]U.S. Office of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, Fiscal Year 1976. pp.121-122.

[113]U.S. Office of Education, Analysis of ..... op. cit., p. 43.

[114]Ibid.

[115]U.S. Office of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner....., op. cit., p.127.

[116]U.S. Office of Education, Analysis of ...., op. cit., p.17.

[117]U.S. Office of Education, Application for Grants Under Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program, 1978, p.B-2.

[118]Grants, pp.13-16.

[119]U.S. Office of Education, Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.420.

[120]Ibid.

[121]U.S. Congress, Education Amendments of 1978, Title XIII, Part A, Sec. 302, p.227.

[122]U.S. Congress, House Committee of Education and Labor and Senate Committee on Human Resources, op. cit., pp. 739-743.

[123]Ibid., pp.738-739.

[124]Sidney Marland, Jr., Career Education, A Proposal For Reform, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974, p.304.

[125]Ibid., p.229.

[126]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.452.

[127]U.S.O.E., Analysis of...., op. cit., p.17.

[128]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.141.

[129]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, op. cit., p.302.

[130]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation, op. cit., pp.488-89.

[131]Ibid., p.488.

[132]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, op. cit., p.302.

[133]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.81.

[134]Ibid.

[135]U.S.O.E. Annual Evaluation, op. cit., p.490.

[136]U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor and Senate Committee on Human Resources, op. cit., Sec. 301, p.98.

[137]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.100.

[138]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of The Right to Read, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978, p.1...

[139]U.S.O.E., Analysis of ..., op. cit., p.49.

[140]Ibid.

[141]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.502.

[142]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of The Right to Read, op. cit., p.7.

[143]U.S. Congress, Education Amendments of 1978, Title II, Sec. 201, p.62.

[144]National Action Committee for Drug Education, Getting to the Roots in Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention. Washington: Academy for Educational Development, 1978, p.27.

[145]U.S.O.E., Analysis of ...., op. cit., p.17.

[146]National Action Committee for Drug Education, op. cit., pp.9-15.

[147]U.S.O.E., Analysis of ...., op. cit., p.4.

[148]National Action Committee for Drug Education, op. cit., p.11.

[149]Education Daily, op. cit., p.3. U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.511.

[150]Community Education Advisory Council, An Evaluation of the Community Education Program, p.1.

[151]U.S.O.E., Directory of Community Education Projects Fiscal Year 1977, p.1.

[152]Community Education Advisory Council, op. cit., p.30.

[4]Ibid., p.23.

[154]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.537.

[155]Ibid. and Education Daily, op. cit., p.4.

[156]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commission...., op. cit., p.107.

[157]Ibid.

[158]U.S.O.E., Women's Educational Equity Act, Annual Report, Sept. 1978.

[159]U.S.O.E., Application for Grants Under the Ethnic Studies Program, p.D-7.

[160]Ibid., p.D-9.

[161]U.S.O.E., List of Funded Projects for Ethnic Heritage Studies Program.

[162]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation...., op. cit., p.346.

[163]Ibid.

[164]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation, op. cit., p.533.

[165]Ibid.

[166]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner...., op. cit., p.105, Education Daily, op. cit., p.4.

[167]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.106.

[168]U.S.O.E., Office of Consumer Education, Summary of Contract and Grant Awards, 1978.

[169]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation, p.540.

[170]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner, op. cit., p.104.

[171]U.S. Congress, Education Amendments of 1978, Sec. 351, p.80.

[172]U.S.O.E., Annual Report of the Commissioner...., op. cit., p.76.

[173]U.S. Congress, Education Amendments of 1978, Sec. 353, p.81.

[174]U.S.O.E., Environment Ed. Program, List of Environmental Education

[175]U.S.O.E., Analysis of ..., op. cit., p.17.

[176]U.S.O.E., Annual Evaluation..., op. cit., pp. 527-528.

[177]U.S.O.E., Analysis of..., op. cit., p.47.

[178]Ibid., p.17.

[179]Ibid., p.48.

Chapter 5

5

THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS

It has been shown that through time the development of teacher education paralleled the development of new thought in education, that formalized teacher training began in the Middle Ages, and that licensure and public control of teacher education resulted from politicizing teacher training during the Reformation. Also, the growth of teacher education in America has been described from the formation of normal schools to the development of teacher education as an academic discipline in schools, colleges, and departments of education.

Historically, the primary role of teacher education was to train teachers in content, methodology, and the giving of information. However, recent research suggests a growing emphasis on training related to humanization of education, community relations, curriculum innovations, classroom management, and cultural attitudes of teachers.

THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS

Clearly, teacher education should be a continuous, on-going process. Since finances often are not available locally or at the state level, there have been significant federal activities and influence in professional training over the years. The federal government became involved in teacher education informally, through land grant colleges for instance, and later formally through such programs as the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act.

Currently, the primary means for conducting federal activities are programs--clusters of related activities developed to achieve specific objectives. There are about one hundred fifty such education-related programs, forty-four of which are directly related to teacher education and which have a teacher training component. The majority of them have been reported in a previous chapter.

These programs are vast in scope and costly to carry out. Thus, the federal government continues to seek adequate means for establishing, executing, and evaluating the contributions that it makes to the improvement of education through teacher training. In addition, it continues to seek effective ways for allocating resources. Hence, there are authentic reasons for the current focus on improving program performance at the federal level. The federal government influences the procedures of state and local governments' efforts toward teacher education in several important ways: (1) it is an increasing source of revenue; (2) federal decisions affect the size and substance of state and local programs; (3) the federal government is a vital force for innovative programs; and (4) the federal government often sets the example for state and local governments in adopting educational reforms and in improving management techniques and practices.

THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS

The study reported in this chapter attempted to determine the influence that federal legislation and federal funding policies have had on the direction, content, and practices in teacher education. The objective was to assess if and how the use of federal funds impacted upon teacher training programs. In other words, what changes occurred as a result of federal assistance, and what changes had been institutionalized as a result of federal aid? The intent was to determine if, indeed, innovations remained or if they disappeared when funding ceased. It was satisfying to learn that some portions of all programs surveyed had been institutionalized. Of course, there is no assurance that these portions *will be maintained*, but it was the expectation of the respondents that they would be.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

The research, which focused on five major program areas, involved assessments requested from deans of schools, colleges, and departments of education, project directors of federal programs, school officials, and other experts from more than ninety different institutions nationwide that presently receive federal funding for teacher education programs.

Although the federal government finances numerous programs directly related to teacher training, as was previously discussed, the following five major programs were selected for this study:

1. Bilingual Education
2. Indian Education
3. Special Education
4. Teacher Corps
5. Vocational Education

THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS

Selection of these programs was based on a number of factors including: (a) the substantial amount of attention that each program receives; (b) widespread interest expressed in public and professional circles related to these particular areas; (c) their actual interface with other programs and practices; and (d) their prominent pre-service components. In addition, programs were in place long enough in most cases to allow time for institutionalization. Indeed, a vast amount of publicity on the equalization of educational opportunities and professional development has encouraged federal activity, concern, and intervention related to these programs in the recent past, and all have received major federal investments.

The Urban/Rural School Development Program was omitted from this survey simply because it had been discontinued prior to the time that the survey was conducted. It is known, however, that this program had a lasting impact on staff development. According, to Robert Bush of SRI International, the California School Improvement Program legislation (Code AB-65) was greatly influenced by the results of the Urban/Rural experience. In addition, the Urban/Rural experience influenced the 1978 Teacher Corps Regulations (Federal Register, Vol. 43, No. 37). The requirement of a Policy Board in each project is one example of such influence.

All programs surveyed were described more fully in the previous chapter; however, the following summary of each particularly relates to professional development. Funds in Bilingual Education are set aside for pre-service and in-service training leading to certification and advanced degrees, for technical assistance centers, for the development of teacher training programs, and for fellowships. The Indian Education Act funds the development of programs for teachers, aides, social workers, administrators, and other

school personnel at both the pre-service and in-service levels. However, in this program more control rests with parents and the community, and local programs are designed to fulfill local assessed needs.

A number of programs are included under the Special Education umbrella most of which contain funding for training. Both pre-service and in-service is funded for preparation and continuing education for a number of professional personnel: teachers, administrators, supervisors, speech pathologists, audiologists, specialists in physical education and recreation, teacher educators, vocational and career educators, paraprofessionals, and volunteers. More recently, dean's grants have been funded to revise teacher education programs for regular classroom teachers to include "mainstreaming." The goal is to prepare regular classroom teachers to teach handicapped children in the "least restrictive environment" which for some is the regular classroom for at least part of the day.

The Teacher Corps program is one of the longer-lasting professional development programs. Initially established to fulfill teacher shortages, the program has evolved from primarily pre-service preparation to in-service training. It contains a tripartite governance provision which is shared by the higher education institution, the local school system, and the community. Teacher Corps is committed not only to the improvement of education personnel development systems but also to the improvement of school climate, institutionalization of innovations, and dissemination to other education agencies.

Vocational Education funds training of personnel in several ways. Stipends are awarded to selected candidates for leadership training, recertification, and certification of persons entering the teaching profession

from other fields. Training is also funded for bilingual vocational education, demonstration and dissemination projects, and to familiarize personnel with new developments in the field of vocational education. While many programs have teacher preparation components, these five seem to have the most far-reaching influence on teacher education nationwide.

Questionnaires were sent to persons mentioned previously from the ninety participating institutions. A concerted effort was made to elicit content information from these experts and to assess their perceptions of the effectiveness of changes that federal legislation and federal funding may have had on teacher education programs and practices. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first part requested information which described the federally funded project currently operating in each respondent's institution. The second section asked for their views on the success of the project in improving teacher education. And, finally, the third division solicited the respondent's opinion relative to future programs and practices.

The first section of the questionnaire dealt with the following issues: (1) new programs, (2) new courses, (3) new training practices, (4) competency-based programs, (5) student participation in pre-student teaching field experiences, (6) student teaching, (7) community involvement, (8) students' involvement with the teaching population, (9) use of audiovisual materials, (10) collaboration between university and school district, (11) collaboration between university and community, (12) parental involvement, and (13) collaboration between community, university, and the local school system. In addition to the thirteen questions, respondents were asked to give narrative information related to descriptions of: (a) kinds of new courses; (b) changes

in student teaching; and (c) additional collaborative involvement.

Several terms were used in the questionnaire and throughout the respondents' replies that warrant definition to insure commonality in interpreting data. *Competency-based teacher education* (CBTE) refers to those training programs that require students to demonstrate skills. Generally, the skills are sequenced to be successively more difficult or complex. Usually CBTE programs are field-based and involve demonstrations with children as participants. *Pre-student teaching field experience* refers to such activity as mentioned above but also a broader range of experiences from observation to small group instruction to teacher's aide to teaching short lessons to large groups. *Extended student teaching* refers to the time a student practices the role of teacher under supervision of a master teacher and a university supervisor. Early programs were limited to five or six weeks, but in recent years student teaching has been extended to a full semester, a full year, or in some situations such as Teacher Corps, a two-year internship. Extended student teaching may or may not be accompanied by coursework. *Collaboration* implies coordination and cooperation of two or more groups in planning, governance, and implementation of programs. Collaboration may occur between the higher education institution, the local school system, the community, students, parents, or any combination of the above. Usually collaboration occurs between higher education institutions, school systems, and the community. *Parental involvement* in this context implies that parents are involved in the school's academic program in a variety of ways--through participation in decision making, governance, planning the individual child's educational program, volunteering, tutoring, and functioning as a teacher's aide. In these ways and perhaps others, parents are involved in the school's

program and indirectly in the training of teachers who work in these schools. *Professional development* denotes training at both the pre-service and in-service levels. This training may occur in a higher education institution, a school setting, or a non-school setting. Occasionally, it implies education through participation in the community depending on the federally-funded program regulations. Professional development can be for university credit, continuing education units, or no credit depending on its purpose. These terms were clarified with respondents prior to their participation in the survey.

The following delineates the responses from the five programs in relationship to such changes brought about because of federal funding.

INNOVATIONS

All reporting institutions described changes as a result of having implemented federal programs. For example,

1. All added new courses.
2. All improved or extended student teaching in some way.
3. All added collaboration to some degree--IHE with school, community, or both.
4. All determined that their graduates who participated in the program were better teacher educators as a result of participation.

In addition, all respondents identified specific changes in the first three areas mentioned above. They are listed below in the separate categories.

1. *Kinds of New Courses*

Special Education
- Courses Related to Public Law 94-142
- Method for Teaching Pre-school Exceptional Children
- Occupational Preparation for the Handicapped
- Problems in Occupational Preparation for the Handicapped
- Diagnostic and Prescriptive Teaching
- Mainstreaming

Introduction to the Exceptional Child

Teacher Corps
- Multicultural Education
- Indian Education
- Exceptional Children in the Regular Classroom
- Teaching the Inner-City Youth
- Parent Education

Vocational Education
- Graduate Leadership seminars
- Research Teacher Training
- Curriculum Development and Administration
- Career Education
- Special Needs Methodology
- Human Relations
- Internship Experience for All Participants

Indian Education
- Indian Culture

Bilingual Education
- Foundations of Bilingual Education
- Methods and Materials of Bilingual Education
- Curriculum in Bilingual Education
- Addition of a Greek Language Component
- More Field-based Internships
- Linguistics and Methodology
- More Spanish Components

2. *Changes in Student Teaching*

Special Education
- Significant Increase in Student Teaching Experience
- Pre-student Teaching Experience
- New In-service for Student Teachers
- Practicum Experiences Before Teaching Experience
- Training for Directors and Supervisors of Student Teachers
- More Delineation of Specific Skills
- Performance-based Competence

Teacher Corps
- Significant Increase in Student Teaching Experiences
- Parallel Field Experiences Along with All Credential Courses
- Development of an Alternative Training Program
- Development of a Team-learning Program
- Tutorial-to-team-teaching Experience
- Required Community Involvement
- Required Curriculum Development Experience
- Required Involvement with Parents
- Required Classroom Visitations
- New and Innovative Training Programs

Vocational Education
- Continued Outstanding Training Programs
- Required Curriculum Development Experience

Indian Education
- Significant Increase in Student Teaching Experience
- New Programs for Rural Areas
- All Trainees Work Part-time as Teacher Aides
- Increased Numbers of Practice Teachers ("Previously, Native Americans were aides with little hope for acquiring credentials to teach. They 'practiced' forever.")

Bilingual Education
- New Program for Bilingual Supervising Teachers
- Competency-based Program
- Significant Increase in Student Teaching Experience
- Bilingual Education Made an Integral Part of Pre-service Program
- Improved Quality of Experience
- New Multilingual/multicultural Program

3. *Additional collaborative involvement*

Special Education
- Total involvement in the development of training objectives Student teachers placed in mainstreamed classes
- Improved advisory council relations
- Superintendent's involvement in in-service
- Wider distribution of curriculum materials related to handicapped students
- Community involvement in pre-student teaching and student teaching experience
- Greater total joint collaboration
- Student teachers required to attend parent meetings
- Adjunct appointments for school system personnel
- New collaborative field experience agreements
- Greater number of student teaching sites for special education
- Significant increase in parental involvement
- Use of public school building for summer student teaching
- Greater involvement in special education with regular education personnel
- Increased involvement with community agents

Teacher Corps
- Joint school, community, university boards
- Full time community council
- Total joint collaboration
- Significant increase in parental involvement
- Parents as input agents
- Increased shared decision-making
- Strong in-service thrust

Strong evaluation model
Development of innovative community involvement models
Collaborative curriculum development
Student involvement

Vocational Education
Establishing internship programs
State Department involvement
Greater total joint collaboration
Significant increase in parental involvement
Collaborative involvement in field trips
Internship argeement plan
Coordination of community-based internships
Involvement with CETA (Comprehensive Educational Training Act)

Indian Education
Collaboration with Indian school boards
Collaborative development of united scholarship service
Greater total collaboration (including tribes)
Greater parental involvement
Navajo tribe contract with universities
Development of Indian Advisory Board
Indian tribe involved in curriculum development
Student involvement
Fieldwork placements
Substitutes provided in order to release teachers for in-service

Bilingual Education
More field-based university courses
Curriculum changes based on field involvement
Collaboration in curriculum development
Inter- and intra-district collaboration
Greater parental involvement
Trainees working directly with parents
Greater total joint involvement
Increased collaboration in competency based programs
Student involvement

A careful comparison of the lists reveals the interrelatedness of the programs both in service to the client population and in teacher training practices. New courses revealed a concern for cultural and curriculum matters. Changes in student teaching generally included a longer time period, early field experiences, and demonstrated competencies. Collaborative involvement reflected more interaction between agencies and more parental participation.

THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS

INSTITUTIONALIZATION

In addition to the innovations mentioned above, certain programs and practices were institutionalized and were no longer dependent upon federal funds for continuation. They are shown on the chart on the following page. In viewing this chart the reader must keep in mind the limited sample of institutions surveyed and the fact that each check mark represents several different programs in each category. In addition, several projects had been newly funded and had not had time to be institutionalized. Actually, a total of seventy-two practices had been made a permanent part of the teacher education programs as noted in the final column. The reader will notice, too, that some practices were institutionalized as a result of federal funding in which the innovation is not generally a primary objective such as "special education" resulting from a bilingual program and "visiting community agencies" from a special education program.

In addition to eliciting data discussed above, this section of the questionnaire dealt with these other issues: (1) improvement in teacher instruction, (2) value of extended practice teaching, (3) value of collaboration, (4) value of competency based teacher education, (5) programs which are no longer federally funded, and (6) new practices.

Critically important modifications of existing programs are being implemented in all five fields as a result of federal funding. Improved student teaching experiences, especially in terms of length of time spent in the field, as well as involvement with parents and curriculum, was evidenced. Learning by doing and competency-based approaches appeared to be a dominant emphasis in the majority of projects. And evidence was provided that more joint collaboration exists. It must be noted, nevertheless, that there

Bilingual Program or Practice	Indian Education	Special Education	Teacher Education	Vocational Corps	Education	Number of Practices
1. In-Service education	x	x		x		13
2. Pre-student teaching field experience	x			x		12
3. Special education	x					9
4. Competency-based teacher education	x			x		8
5. Multicultural education	x	x		x		8
6. Self-assessment		x		x		8
7. Visiting community agencies			x	x		6
8. Extended periods of student teaching	x			x		5
9. Bilingual education	x					2
10. Living in the community		x				1

are two kinds of collaboration, a coerced collaboration on one hand, and an uninhibited exchange of ideas and services as seen in an equal-partnership concept on the other. Coerced collaboration is used frequently in teacher education. Fortunately, according to the findings in this section, more teacher-centered collaboration involving community clientele, parents, and students is emerging as a result of assistance from the federal government.

In these areas--improvement in teacher instruction, programs which are no longer federally funded, and new practices--respondents commented on positive changes which were brought about as a result of federal funding. Comments in each category follow.

1. *Improvement in teacher instruction*

Special education
- Additional staff to make classroom visits and observations possible on a consulting basis
- More experience with a wider variety of families with children with disabilities
- More intensive and longer periods of training
- Better time management

Teacher Corps
- More involvement with the LEA improved the quality of teaching
- Time provided to teach the target population, Native Americans
- More on-site experiences
- Increased practice teaching experiences
- Working with well-informed professors
- More available programs in institutions

Vocational Education
- Internships in external agencies

Indian Education
- Had no teacher education program before federal funding

Bilingual Education
- More intensive field requirements
- Trainees learning about various cultures

2. *Programs which are no longer federally funded*

Special Education
- Minimal experiences beyond the normal child

Year-long internship for undergraduates
Gifted and talented reading for Special Education
Developing a Special Education program for all handicapping areas
Continuing work for inadequately prepared children
State funded programs
Modules involving mainstreaming
Competency validation methods
Training regular classroom teachers to work with children

Teacher Corps
Resident Teacher Program
Modification of basic programs
Mainstreaming
Earlier and more field experiences
Education for the gifted
Career education
Joint math/science program
Clinical training programs
Management by objectives
State-mandated programs

Vocational Education
New facilities for entire department
Greater visability on campus
Reading improvement program
Disadvantaged and handicapped program
Weekly seminars
Health occupations
Teacher education

Indian Education
Annual summer program
Annual field trips to Indian schools
Field-based school administrator program
Management information systems
Improved academic courses
State-supported program
Native American language instruction

Bilingual Education
Cultural programs
Related research projects
Collaboration with other institutions
American Indian option
Development of graduate programs in bilingual education
Teacher training in remote areas
Changes in course content

3. *New practices*

Special Education
Changed attitudes

Improved teacher skills related to the handicapped
More in-depth training experience
Clarified and specified content
More openness of staff
Modeling effect was beneficial
Better-prepared teachers
Utilized more self-evaluation devices
Presented with future course content
In-depth information related to PL94-142
Alternatives provided
On-site experience provided
Regular teachers were trained to work with exceptional children
Provided assistance in individualization instruction
Made aware of concepts of mainstreaming

Teacher Corps
More staff interaction
More involvement with the community
More local school input
Provided intensive staff development for faculty members
Increased human resources for teacher education
Provided audiovisual training and materials
More student-centered concepts
More field-based experiences
Provided a very positive link between theory and practice
Provided help for Indian children
Improved career options
Utilized career options
More openness of staff
Extensive innovations

Vocational Education
More seminars that relate to current problems
Appropriate first-year-teaching orientation
More field-based experiences
Added faculty
Provided new facilities
Greater visability for vocational education
Greater interaction with staff
Better-prepared to work with handicapped students
Better-trained faculty and administration
New quality demonstrated in training
Better able to apply knowledge and skills
More field trips which provide alternative processes

Indian Education
Provided practice teaching experiences especially for Indians
Extensive training provided
Improved curriculum for Indians
Provided professional courses earlier in training program
Made it possible for Indians to achieve administrative positions
Improved internships

Improved all academic areas
Made it possible for Indians to attend college

Bilingual Education
Provided more cultural programs
Improved services for minority students
Provided a greater awareness in multicultural education
Provided an awareness of linguistic differences
More on-the-job experiences for students
More relevant training programs
Improved competency-based on-site training
Attitudinal changes

From data provided by the institutions, it can be seen that the funded programs had a lasting impact in ways that were not always part of their original proposal and frequently were not measured. Not only did students learn more at the knowledge level, but because of the new programs, students had more opportunities to practice and develop skills and to develop more positive attitudes.

PREDICTIONS OF FUTURE PROGRAMS

The last section of the survey raised questions regarding the anticipated future of teacher education, particularly, federal funding of special programs. These issues were raised: (1) continuation of federal assistance; (2) focus of pre-service and in-service education; (3) focus related to student performance or student needs; and (4) continuing programs and practices. Responses indicated that:

1. Federal assistance is expected to continue to exist in its present form for the next fifteen years or more.
2. Federally funded programs probably will focus specifically on in-service education, and pre-service education will play a less significant role in the future.
3. Teacher education is expected to focus largely on training teachers to educate students with special needs.
4. Teacher education programs are expected to continue in the areas of special education, in-service education (professional development), and multicultural education.

THE SUCCESS OF SELECTED FEDERAL PROJECTS

The survey was conducted prior to proposed changes in programs and funding which have been advanced by the new administration. Perhaps with this new information respondents would have had different opinions particularly in regard to the first prediction mentioned above.

Two questions required narrative information related to (1) predictions of teacher training programs which would be maintained if federal assistance was not continued, and (2) projections of other foci which will be included in teacher education programs in the long range future (over 15 years). Responses are recorded below.

1. *Teacher training programs which would be implemented without federal assistance*

Special Education
- In-service for teachers of hearing-impaired children
- Change in program priorities
- Field-based teacher education
- Collaborative efforts for children with special learning needs
- Values education
- Teacher centers
- Mainstreaming strategies
- Increased teacher education

Teacher Corps
- Expanded on-site practice teaching experiences
- Expanded re-education programs
- Mainstreaming
- Multicultural education
- Parent education
- Special education
- Competency based education
- Expanded joint collaboration
- Encourage more federal involvement
- More federal mandated programs
- Collaboration with teacher organizations

Vocational Education
- Expanded, intensified teacher training
- Research of policy, priorities, and new teaching modes
- Be more alert and careful to changes and build upon what we already have
- Bilingual education

Videotape laboratories (simulation experiences)
Intensive pre-practice teaching experiences with students
Working with special needs groups

Indian Education
Health education
Bilingual education
Continued work in rural education
Multicultural education
On-site teacher education
Assistant from private grant programs, state funds, and universities

Bilingual Education
Multicultural education
Service to the community
Bilingual education
Special education
Teacher education
Career re-training
Competency based education
Pre-practice teaching
Expanded field experiences

2. *Predictions of other foci which will be included in teacher education programs in the long-range future*

Special Education
Teacher Centers
Devices that will be able to detect teacher potential very early
Two or more years of internship
More individualization
Increased emphasis on teacher education
Increased emphasis on teacher competencies
Independent educational therapists
Closer partnership between regular and special education
General upgrading of teacher education
More emphasis on serving the severely handicapped child
Students assuming more financial responsibility
College for lower ability students
International education
Emphasis on the teacher's role as institutional manager
Competency-based certification
Much more practice, much less theory
Adult special education programs

Teacher Corps
A new curricular foci (i.e. death education)
Community education
Classroom research
New emphasis on State legislation
Minimum competency regulations
Increased individualized instruction

Improved use of technology
All teacher education outside of the university
Training of teachers as counselors
Greater intensity in training of people to work in community
Research training programs
Expanded internship
Field-based degree programs
Parent education
Appropriate programs for culturally different children
Back to the basics
More "futuring" skill building

Vocational Education
Closer collaboration with other training agencies
Career education
Wiser use of computers
Classrooms without walls
Satellite education at home
Higher education standards
Models for behavior management
Better understanding of the relationship of school to the world of work
A drastic change in vocational education programs where the entire person is educated, not just skill-trained
More impact on teacher centers

Indian Education
Perfecting the program to prepare Indian counselors and administrators
More thrust towards psychologists, social workers, administrators, and business managers for school systems
Humanistic education
More relevant college coursework

Bilingual Education
Multilinguistic education
Multicultural education
Bilingual education for all children
Establishment of a solid scientific base
Personalized education
Life-long learning
Education for parenting
Mainstreaming

In summary of this section, the general nature of comments provided indicates that very little will differ with or without federal support. Predictions continue to address refined skill development, a humanistic approach, and special training for special needs of client groups. In all

programs there appears to be an overlap which expands beyond the bounds of the primary intent of the program to what is allowable in other programs. What appeared to be absent was a consideration of the probable future of public education (thus teacher education), possible changes in funding patterns, higher costs of education, and state control of programs through certification regulations. Narrative predictions seemed to reflect respondents' needs rather than what realistically might be possible.

The last chapter will describe some predictions for the future of teacher education. It will also enumerate influencing factors that may control the development of teacher education, finally, it will explore some possibilities which seem realistic as of this writing.

Chapter 6

6

AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The Carnegie Council's report on higher education stated that twenty years ago views were formed as to where higher education should aim in the future. These views were aimed toward greater strength in science, accommodating the wave of new students, creating open-access institutions, creating greater equal opportunity, and preparing more medical personnel.[1] These aims were clear and definable, were responsive to national needs, and were approached with anticipation. Most of these aims have been significantly achieved.

Now, however, moods have changed. The public no longer looks to the future with anticipation, but with anxiety. Apprehension dominates decision makers. The outlook for the future of higher education is overshadowed by fear of declining enrollments, increasing costs, and decreasing financial support. To counteract this, the Council declared that higher education needs a mood of anticipation and a sense of purpose as much as anything.[2] The Council acknowleged that financial support may be modest; nevertheless, higher education will need to make the following contributions in the next twenty

years as these are of great importance to the nation.

1. Places to accommodate by 2010 approximately the same number of students as were enrolled in 1978.
2. Institutions representing at least the degree of diversity we have today.
3. Resources to impart higher levels of skill attainment than ever before.
4. Capabilities for more advanced scientific research.
5. Capabilities to educate a more active, better-informed, more humanely oriented citizenry.
6. Capabilities to offer greater equality of opportunity and the possibility of a greater equality of earned income.
7. Abilities to provide ever more constructive evaluation for national self-renewal.
8. Capacities to provide more services to the surrounding community.
9. Capability to maintain a network of contact and communication.[3]

The report goes on to say that it is up to the universities to be not only responsive to the needs of the nation as in the past but also to alter the mood of the nation through positive influences such as those mentioned above.

In nearly all the material reviewed in this chapter, the writers found consistent emphasis on the necessity of institutions of higher education to bring about improvements in education. The Carnegie report refers to higher education in general, but the implications for teacher education are clear. Each of the nine "contributions," in some way, can be applied to schools, colleges, and departments of education. And if teacher educators become responsive to and responsible for these contributions, then, too, they must become more active participants in policy making.

Policy making issues of greatest concern seem to focus most heavily upon funding and governance. Who will provide the sources of financial support in the future? And will those sources insist upon control of programs? In matters of governance, who will determine teacher selection, preparation, certification, and professional development? By what principles will they be guided? These questions of *who* and *how* seem to be more important than *what*

AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

FUNDING

At this writing, critical events are occurring between the new Republican administration and Congress. The most sweeping and controversial changes which were proposed by President Reagan are student aid and block grants. While the new Congress is considerably more conservative than Democratic Congresses in the past twenty years, members must still be responsive to their constituents. They must make difficult decisions which on the one hand save taxpayers money and on the other continue to provide assistance to voters.

Student Aid

Regarding student aid, financial assistance has been provided to students in several ways depending on need. Pell Grants are individual awards to students, and eligibility is based on family income and demonstrated need. New proposals change the eligibility formula so that a smaller number of students would be eligible thus reducing costs of funding. Another form of aid is through the State Student Incentive Grant program. This program provides federal matching funds to states to encourage them to fund student scholarships. Both of these sources of funds have been a boon to economically disadvantaged students, and both grant programs are considered to be directly responsible for the rapid increase in enrollment of minority students in the past ten years.

Another form of assistance has been the Federally Insured Student Loan Program. A revised proposal would require students to pay an annual fee of four percent of the principal to help reduce interest subsidies. Also, interest rates on National Direct Student Loans would increase markedly. These proposed changes would most affect students of middle income families.

In essence, the effect would be that fewer middle income students could attend private schools.

Now, what is the relationship of student loans and grants to teacher education? If fewer students can afford to attend college because of reduced aid, then already financially strapped institutions will have to cut programs. Because of an oversupply of teachers in recent years, enrollment in pre-service teacher education programs has declined throughout the country. The continuing existence of those programs that did not change to meet current demands is most threatened. In some cases, institutions fund research in teacher education. Where enrollment is falling, the institutions will not have the means to continue such support.

Block Grants

A great deal of uncertainty surrounds Reagan's proposed block grants which would be a consolidation of federal categorical aid programs into grants controlled by the state and local school districts. As of this writing, most of the block-grant proposals have been rejected. Even so, in one announcement, the House Budget Committee chairman, James Jones, did not rule out the possibility of such action in the future. With this possibility in mind then, it is appropriate to review the concept of block grants, the effect they may have on the future of teacher education, and the responsibility of states in preparing for their new roles in the administration of federal funds.

Essentially, proposals for the block grants were formed by consolidating forty-four elementary and secondary education programs into two block grants--one to go to the states and one to the local school districts. The bill is intended to shift control of education policy to state and local governments

and away from federal agencies. Also, the reduction in regulations is expected to reduce the states' administrative costs thus compensating for other budget cuts.[4]

If the block grants are to be approved as proposed, state and local authorities will determine the provisions for using approximately four billion dollars. Most urban mayors oppose this plan as state governments historically are unsympathetic to the needs of large cities.

The Reconciliation Act of 1981 contains two parts. Grants to school districts would be made to those undergoing desegregation and to serve economically disadvantaged and handicapped children. Grants to states will include funds that currently support approximately forty programs with professional development components. The major programs are listed below.

1. Teacher Corps
2. Handicapped - Part D
3. Teacher Centers
4. Title IV - Civil Rights
5. ESAA - Special Programs
6. Alcohol & Drug Abuse
7. Handicapped - Early Childhood
8. Pre-College Science Teacher Training
9. Territorial Teacher Training
10. Arts Education
11. Metric Education
12. Career Education
13. Community Education
14. Follow Through
15. Consumer Education
16. Basic Skills Improvement
17. Handicapped - Severely Handicapped

If, in fact, federal funds will be distributed to states to fund professional development that is currently under federal control, then the states must do some serious thinking and assessment to determine the foci they wish to pursue.

In the summary report of the 1974 Institute for Chief State School Officers, Grant Venn stated that leadership for analysis and formulations of changes must come from the states both individually and collectively. The following were suggested as approaches that might bring about major changes.

AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

1. The states collectively should establish specific minimal competencies in each of the basic tool skill areas and each state should make them the first priority for funding, staffing and organizing.

2. The states should convene a task force to study and report the ways that are being tried and ways that might be used to provide alternatives to earn the high school diploma.

3. The rigidity of the present public education pattern as to schedule, curriculum, staffing and financing allows for little individualization of instruction or development of alternative learning styles.

4. Ways must be found and policies established in the states which provide opportunities for youth to participate in the real world as part of their education.

5. States must begin to develop policies which change the concept and the myth that all education takes place while one is young.

6. There is a need to develop a required review of each young person's education, upon reaching the high school, which will become the basis for planning the next several years of education.

7. It is obvious that the schools alone cannot educate our youth. State Departments should encourage, through policies and financing, the use of other societal agencies and resources to be part of the planned educational program of high school and older youth.

8. The fifty states should organize a commission to establish the values that are significant in approaching problems that must be faced in the future.

9. The immediate future will see three groups that must become more active in our society--women, minorities and retired persons. State departments of education need to look at how education should be altered to further educate and to use these resources.

10. Our society presently does not have a method for helping our young make the transition to adulthood, to the work force, to full responsibility or to independence. Can education be seen as relevant by our young if it assumes no responsibility for helping them find a place in society?

11. Planning for the future was the essence of the institute both for the individual and the educator. Each state should devote some resources and some joint efforts to "thinktanking" the implications of change in society as it affects education and the role of the state.[5]

While this list was first compiled in 1974, its message is still valuable as states plan to assume more control over federal monies. After determining

priorities for education within the state, the state in collaboration with schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs), local school districts, and teachers' professional associations should determine the best approaches to professional development. The following section is intended to provide considerations for the future developments of teacher education.

PREDICTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

As we move toward the Twenty-first Century, it appears that the federal government will continue to influence education, and thus teacher education, in some basic ways--life-long learning from early childhood through adult education will be a continuing thrust; aid to economically and socially disadvantaged children will go on but at a reduced amount and for more limited purposes; handicapped education will continue but to a lesser degree; and assistance to non-English speaking students will persist in an effort to move them into the mainstream as quickly as possible.

In support of these policies, teacher education programs will be expected to place more emphasis on educational technology, communication skills, and personal development such as critical thinking skills. This is particularly important as we recognize that much of the information that we currently hold will be obsolete in twenty-five years. The significance of in-service education will rise, not only for teachers who work with children but also for professors and other higher education personnel who are in the business of training teachers. This is of special importance to universities as they plan for the allocation of funds for professional development.

The National Center for Education Statistics reports that the need for

teachers in specialized fields is burgeoning. Shortages already exist in special education, mathematics, and science. Other fields expected to be in demand are vocational and industrial education, learning disabilities, gifted and talented, and agriculture. Whether or not these programs have federal support, schools, colleges, and departments of education would do well to revise their academic programs to address growing needs if they expect to remain viable organizations.

As teacher training institutions change to meet the subject area needs, they should keep in mind some basic suppositions that may undergird whatever direction teacher education takes. It is likely that teacher education will become more practice-oriented through actual experience and apprenticeships under master teachers. There is evidence of this trend in some states such as Virginia where a proposal has been made to grant certification to holders of bachelor of arts degrees after they have completed a minimal amount of education coursework and have demonstrated teaching competencies in their early years of employment as a teacher. This leads to other suppositions such as, teachers will be trained to work in narrower, situation-bound areas; the school system will be the laboratory; teachers themselves will assume more responsibility for teacher training; and the teaching profession will have a more active role in the certification of new teachers.

Since teachers will be trained for situation-specific jobs initially, there will be a greater need for continuing education as teachers must be "re-cycled" to fulfill needs of the future. In businesses and industries, technical teachers will be trained on the job, and they will study methodology and industrial techniques after they have begun teaching. These factors demonstrate the need for teacher educators to emphasize in-service education

and to develop programs to meet the needs of practitioners.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has taken the lead in proposing to the federal government ways in which institutions of higher education can participate in teacher education policy decisions. In a 1978 Governmental Relations Commission report, the following principles were presented to promote involvement of schools, colleges, and departments of education in teacher education policy-making at the federal level.

I. Centrality of Teacher Education in Educational Reform

It is widely recognized that the single most important determinant of children's learning is the quality of teaching they receive. Any effort to reform education must therefore concentrate on improving the quality of teaching by fostering professional growth of teachers and other educational personnel. Educational personnel preparation and development are functions central to reform.

Whenever the federal government prepares new legislation designed to achieve educational reforms, we urge that lawmakers consider the role SCDEs must play in preparing and developing school personnel.

II. Assistance for Schools of Education

The federal government often enacts new education programs without considering the steps required for their successful implementation. SCDEs can assist in this process, but only with adequate time and monies. We urge that all federal personnel development programs provide for assistance to SCDEs so that they may accommodate the direct and often indirect requirements of new legislation.

Grants for this purpose should be distributed prior to the major block of funds and earmarked for the purpose of enabling SCDEs to plan, initiate, and carry out their own staff and curricular development in advance of new demands on the system. (The federal government's failure to provide resources directly to schools, colleges, and departments of education for either the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act or the 1975 Education of all Handicapped Children Act has contributed significantly to limiting the capabilities of SCDEs to respond to inservice needs of teachers.)

III. Re-fashioning Schools of Education

Schools of education are attempting to respond to fluctuating enrollments as well as teacher demands for more timely inservice programs. SCDEs need funds to retrain faculty members for new areas of specialization, reach out to educational personnel at local schools, change programs, and become more responsive to emerging needs. We urge the development of a new discretionary program to accomplish these objectives, modeled on the successful Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Deans' Grants program and the Teacher Corps institutional development program.

IV. Research and Development Expertise

With limited federal resources for education, demonstrative projects are often necessary before any broad-scale programs are begun. Careful program evaluation is an essential element in upgrading program performance, as well as the basis for documentation and dissemination of results.

Institutions of higher education have well-developed capabilities for such research. Too often when program evaluation monies are set aside, they are not keyed to IHEs, and a valuable resource is overlooked. (For example, evaluation efforts under CETA/YEDPA ignore the potential of institutions of higher education to contribute to an understanding of structural unemployment.) We urge the consideration of IHE/SCDE capabilities in creating any research, development, and demonstration agenda.

V. Governance Concerns

We urge that faculty members from schools, colleges, and departments of education be involved in the governance of all educational programs. A partnership arrangement including, but not dominated by, faculty members and administrators from SCDEs is an ideal model for federal policy-making and program management. Other participants could include teachers, parents, school administrators, and school board representatives. (For example, a workable system has been designed for the Teacher Corps program, giving the dean or director of the SCDE genuine participatory status with others on local policy boards.)[6]

In more recent efforts, AACTE wrote a letter to the Department of Education's Office of Planning and Budget in which they urged consideration of several alternatives to the Administration's proposed education legislation.

- Delete professional development and technical assistance from the block grant and retain them in their present form as federal categorical programs.

- Delete professional development from the block grant and retain as federal programs, but allocate these monies to the states;

provide a mechanism by which such allocations could be made for the purposes of staff and professional development to LEAs and SCDEs.

- Retain professional development as part of the block grant proposal but establish percentage set asides (of from 10 to 20 percent) of these funds to be used for purposes of preservice and inservice teacher training with explicit authority for state and local agencies to enter into training arrangements with IHEs and SCDEs.

AACTE also proposed that the administration's draft proposal include additional language to permit the state to allocate to SCDEs three to five percent of the sums appropriated for the purposes of:

- developing model projects within schools of education to carry out improved preservice or inservice program support activities for preparing and serving elementary or secondary school teachers;

- retaining faculty members of such schools of education to provide courses of study for training elementary and secondary school teachers in programs of career education, education of gifted and talented children, education of handicapped individuals, community education, adult education programs, earth sciences, and other related programs;

- achieving diversification and redirection of education programs for elementary and secondary school teachers in order to make maximum use of human resources in the fields of education and public service.

Finally, AACTE suggested that Sections 114(a) and 207(a) be changed to specify that a state may subgrant to and enter into contracts with schools of education for purposes of training, planning, evaluating, and disseminating.[7]

These recommendations continue to emphasize that professional development should remain within the purview of the national interest, that curriculum development and pedagogy should be included, and that assistance should be provided to the teacher preparation programs in higher education as well as to states and local school systems.

Other educators, too, have shown concern for the future of teacher education. In the Charles W. Hunt lecture at the 1977 AACTE national

conference, David Clark enumerated predictions of the near future for schools, colleges, and departments of education. He predicted that in the next five to seven years we could expect:

1. a decrease in funds to support basic programs
2. continued declining enrollments
3. a sharp decline in external funds for research and development
4. a slight increase in support for knowledge utilization, i.e., dissemination or service.
5. a decline in program quality
6. a negative image of teacher educators in the training of teachers and in knowledge production and utilization
7. a negotiation to establish governance roles regarding teacher certification and program accreditation
8. a change in the structure of teacher education rather than in substance.[8]

Overall, Clark's outlook was negative, and in general his predictions have been confirmed. Most institutions have adopted a conservative posture or have dropped their teacher education program altogether. Even though teacher education is experiencing a temporary recession, Dr. Clark stated that the situation could be reversed if educationists worked on several levels at once. He suggested that at the national governmental level, policy makers must be persuaded to recognize the consequences of allowing teacher education to "atrophy." At the national professional level, organizations should join together to eliminate obvious weaknesses and to strengthen unity in developing accreditation and certification policies. And at the institutional level, teacher educators must press for fair allocation of resources and strongly emphasize quality and excellence.[9]

Primarily, David Clark's predictions were of a general rather than programmatic nature. Harold Shane has made predictions for education in the 1980's, and from these we can infer what will be programmatic thrusts in teacher education programs. His forecast included:

1. an increase in the number of children attending nursery schools and

daycare centers.
2. an increase in pre-natal intervention, alternatives to conception and gestation, and neonatal care.
3. gloomy prospects for postsecondary education in the humanities and teacher education.
4. a post-secondary education "response" to the needs of the post-industrial society.
5. a greater age range of students due to increased "holding power."
6. more attention to students' special needs as a result of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL94-142).
7. a change in the concept of what constitutes "basic" education.
8. new efforts to motivate youth to learn.[10]

Dr. Shane's educational forecast has definite implications for teacher education in the 1980's. Instead of accepting an attitude of conservatism and defensiveness as suggested by Clark, institutions can "tool up" for programs suggested by Shane's forecast, and remain vital and viable organizations. For example, even though Shane's predictions for the future of teacher education are not positive, preparing to meet future needs will result in positive outcomes for schools, colleges, and deparments of education. In response to Shane's forecasts, teacher education programs might be revised or strengthened with more emphasis on early childhood education including human growth and development, sex education including prenatal and neonatal care, special education and training for teachers of "mainstreamed" children in the regular classroom, training teachers for technical fields and providing education on site for business and industry, continued emphasis on the basics plus ecological/environmental education which is basic to the survival of humans in their environment, teaching techniques which are responsive to individual needs, age ranges, motivation, and self-concept, adult and continuing education.

If schools, colleges, and departments of education were revised to meet needs expressed by Shane, institutions would improve their images, recruit more students, and survive on tuition generated by meaningful programs.

Graduates would be more employable as they would fulfill practical needs of the public and private sectors. Consequently, while teacher education might be influenced by federal policies, it will not have to be dependent upon or controlled by federal funding.

The future of the federal Department of Education is still in question. Those who support it believe that education should be a top national priority with Cabinet-level status and that the Department of Education can provide needed services such as the formation of policy, educational personnel development, and research in education. In the past, federal assistance to education has been responsible for the benefits of compensatory education and equal access to quality education, for learning gains in the early years, for training teachers to use better instructional techniques, and for providing student aid and student loans to increase accessibility of post-secondary education. These programs and many more have been subsumed under the Department of Education.

While critics acknowledge the positive outcomes of federal aid, they continue to judge the Department harshly for its many defects. For example, David Savage, in "Education of a New Department," pointed out that the Executive Branch, thus the Department of Education, does not make policy. This is the duty of Congress. Further, he stated that the Department has little administrative power in that the Congress not only determines which programs will be created and maintained, but also how much money will be provided, who will get it, and for what purposes. Savage went on to say that the bureaucracy of regulation, recordkeeping, and paperwork continues to hamper the effectiveness of the department and that the Department has no authority to streamline its programs.[12]

AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

George Neill reiterated some of Savage's concerns and elaborated on others. He identified some positive effects but also pointed out the defects in administration. The administration structure is too complicated; federal control, i.e., "Washington knows best," stifles local autonomy; and overhead on categorical programs is too high. The "siphoning process," according to Neill, removes too many federal dollars before assistance reaches children. For example, costs affiliated with writing and rewriting regulations, the expense of the grant proposal process, and monitoring spending all are excessive drains on Department of Education funds. In addition to the financial drain, manhours are ineffectually used for paperwork and data collection so that school administrators are no longer effective instructional leaders.[13]

While critics fired away at the Department, the Secretary of Education, Terrell H. Bell, proposed several alternatives for President Reagan's consideration. The most unsuitable one was to do away with the department altogether. Others were to create an independent education agency, to include the Department's functions in another federal agency similiar to the old Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to create a National Education Foundation. According to a *Washington Post* editorial, the independent agency would continue to function as the Department does but without Cabinet-level status. Bell envisions the National Education Foundation as a monitor and research/data service for local education programs.

> The foundation would not hand out dollars for federal education programs or enforce federal laws concerning education. Federal money for educational programs would go out as part of the block grants to states, and most of the department's enforcement powers would be laid off on other federal agencies. This would leave the foundation pretty much as a research center that would provide help

to local governments when help was requested.[14]

While any one of these suggestions would allow Reagan to keep his campaign promises, none, except the first, would resolve problems mentioned by Savage and Neill. Rather than take any radical action, Feistritzer and Emig suggest a modification which would maintain involvement at the federal level in some significant ways. Their recommendations are limited to involvement in educational personnel development.

> We believe, that Title V of the Higher Education Act (as amended by PL 96-374) offers a rich and varied portfolio of program opportunities. Teacher Corps with its "school site improvement" orientation, Teacher Centers with its focus on individual teachers, and the Schools of Education Assistance Act offer at least three ways to improve significantly the quality of teaching. If components for merit scholarships, teacher fellowships, and administrator training were to be added during the 97th Congress, and the entire package were adequately funded, we would have attained much for the schools of America.[15]

While these recommendations did not include many smaller programs with professional development components, they did address the major ones and if funded would demonstrate continuing progress in federal involvement in professional development. Unfortunately, recent recommendations by the administration and subsequent action by the Congress negated most efforts for continuing federal education professional development. Thirty-three programs including Teacher Corps, Teacher Centers, the school library program, and emergency school aid have been relegated to block grants to states. However, Congress did re-authorize the following categorical aid programs: Title I grants to aid educationally disadvantaged children, aid to the handicapped, adult education, Women's Educational Equity Act, vocational and bilingual education, and impact aid.[16] The majority of these programs have personnel development components. So, while the major thrust has been slowed, the federal government continues to be involved in teacher education.

AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

CONCLUSION

In consideration of the future of teacher education, a number of thoughts, predictions, and foresights have been reviewed. In conclusion, the final comments are from a speech by Howard Hickey, professor of Education, Michigan State University. Although this speech was presented five years ago, the substance is contemporary. Issues described then still concern educators. Solutions to problems suggested then are still viable. Dr. Hickey's challenge to higher education remains: educators must accept responsibility for change. While he acknowledged many issues in education, he concentrated on two--the Qualitative Educational Revolution and The Processes for Innovation. He emphasized a growing concern for improved quality and described the implementation of "best practice" to "average practice." While the implementation of high quality programs is a slow process, institutions must continue to live up to the challenge. In this era of concern for quality, in order for teacher education to survive now and in the future, post-secondary educators must exhibit exemplary performance in the acquisition and utilization of knowledge, responsiveness to the needs of pre-service and in-service teachers, and collaboration with various educational agencies. This level of performance will be necessary for survival regardless of the origin of funding for teacher education.

Current and Future Issues in American Education and Implications for Teacher Education

One needs only to review the issues in American education over the past twenty years to realize how dangerous it is to forecast future issues in education. Many of the concerns we deal with today did not even exist five years ago. Perhaps the best indicator of the hopes and dreams Americans place on education is the constant attention they pay it. But so long as the American people are willing to persistently criticize it, there is hope.

AN OUTLOOK ON FEDERAL AID FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

An indication of the divergent hopes the people have for our product are the varying kinds of criticisms we hear. It seems to me that this situation will always be true in a democracy; therefore, we cannot expect to find unanimity in what people perceive to be either right or wrong in our schools, or consequently, in our colleges of education.

While there are many more issues, I would like to concentrate on two which seem to have particular impact upon colleges of education: (1) the Qualitative Educational Revolution which will have as its outcome the improvement of the quality of education, and (2) the Processes for Innovation which help implement this higher quality education.

At our bicentennial year, we can look back at what Ernest O. Melby characterizes as the Quantitative Revolution in American education. That is, during the past two hundred years we have seen our schooling process grow from a sometime operation and a very small enterprise serving only a small minority of our citizens in very limited ways to large institutions serving nearly every citizen across many more areas of endeavor. We have seen the holding power of our high schools increase dramatically. Furthermore, we have extended the full use of the schools to the economically and educationally disadvantaged children, as well as to adults. Additionally, we have taken on the responsibility of teaching more than the three R's--from sex education to vocational education, from values education to consumer education, and numerous other areas that once were reserved for the home, community, or church. So today, we can truly say we have universal education in America.

But as we start our third century, there is a need for a Qualitative Revolution. Americans are rapidly becoming more insistent that we examine the quality of what we do. And increasingly, as we have taken on new tasks, we hear people ask, "What are schools for? For what should they be held accountable? How well do our schools do the tasks to which we entrust them?"

We have seen the movement back to more traditional schooling functions--the three R's particularly. As the testing programs show more and more that our children are not learning basic skills and knowledge, we can expect increasing criticism. Businessmen and citizens in general wonder when we will become more accountable for the dollars we demand in light of how little we promise in terms of student outcomes. Our responses that we are teaching the more important skills such as decision making, creativity, and independence do little to quiet the critics.

At the same time, women and minority groups are becoming more demanding that schools must take a more active role in delivering the American dream to them. Still others are taking us to task for our bureaucratization and inhumane treatment of all with whom we work. They ask how we can teach students to care for others when our schools continue to model strategies of instruction which are non-caring and inhumane. And teachers continue to teach in the ways in which they were taught. The criticisms go on, most of them centering around the whole question of quality.

As we face these criticisms, our public is less willing to accept soft data--our feeling and observations. They want facts--hard data. Our responses become more defensive as we blame the students, the community, the

lack of dollars, or most anyone but ourselves. Teachers blame administrators, administrators blame Boards of Education, and they blame everyone else. They all blame universities and colleges of education. One of our challenges, then, is to improve education qualitatively by using the best known means available to us.

The second significant issue is the Process for Innovation. By this I mean how educators implement the best known practice as the average practice. When I entered teaching in 1953, I read that best practice and average practice were fifty years apart in education. Recently, I read that it took us seventeen years to implement driver's training and eleven years for the new math to become the average math taught. Even though the gap is closing, nearly everyone would agree that it still takes us too long to implement what we know are the best known and accepted educational practices.

Universities have long accepted their role for research. Colleges of education, specifically, have accepted their responsibility for research in determining what are the best educational practices. But they have been negligent in accepting the responsibility to help install these practices.

Whenever I hear of research into better educational practices, I am reminded of the back cover article several years ago in the *Phi Delta Kappan*, written somewhat in jest. The author proposed that all new Ph.D.'s be prevented from writing or doing research for five years to allow libraries and schools to clear out all unusable or poor research documents. It seems to me that his point is not completely in jest. However, I would modify it a bit--let's concentrate at least as much on putting into practice what we already know. I believe this is the role for colleges of education.

Public education has done an admirable job coping with increasing demands from increasingly vociferous groups. But I believe that they have demonstrated that they alone cannot help schools make the quantum leap qualitatively that they did quantitatively over the last several decades. I believe the best help they can get in innovation is from colleges of education who have the capability if they decide to gear up for it.

This, then, brings us to the impact of these two issues upon teacher education. Most colleges of education have assumed that their impact upon changing practices in public schools occurred through preparing teachers and administrators and in conducting graduate programs and inservice programs for both groups. There is little evidence, however, that school practice has changed much because of this function. Most formal in-service activities of local schools have not resulted in changing practice either.

As the American public asks for better quality, however they define it, colleges have two choices. They can either respond to this challenge and make major, fundamental changes in their practices, or they will be phased out because they offer few services and functions that schools or the public will demand. The demand for new teachers or graduate school courses and programs as now constituted, will continue to decline. The demand for new research to add to the research already lying unused on our shelves will also decrease dramatically, unless we are willing to work as equals with local, state, and

federal authorities to help implement innovations.

Such action, if we choose to take it, will require new strategies and activities. We will spend a majority of our time on regular assignment working in the field where the problems are. We will offer fewer courses on campus. More of our time will be spent teaching and facilitating non-formal, non-credit, non-degree programs. We will be working for students, not the other way around. We will be more accountable for our work as well as holding students accountable for their work. We will be helping our clients adapt our ideas, knowledge, and programs to their specific setting, rather than saying, "That's your problem."

I have great faith in the concept of university. I believe we have the capacity in us to make the changes necessary if we are to continue to impact upon American education. Our actions during the next twenty-five years will tell whether teacher education institutions remain a viable force in American education.

Howard Hickey
Michigan State University
1976

FOOTNOTES

[1]Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), pp. 88-89.

[2]Ibid., p. 95.

[3]Ibid., pp. 89-95.

[4]"Reagan Asks Congress to End Equity Programs," Peer Perspective, VII (May, 1981), 1, 7.

[5]Grant Venn, ed., Man, Education and Society in the Year 2000, Report of the 1974 Institute for Chief State School Officers (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974), pp. 121-127.

[6]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Shaping Federal Policy for Teacher Education, Report of the Government Relations Commission (Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1978), pp. 6-8. (The Association is hereafter referred to as AACTE.)

[7]"AACTE Rebuts Proposed Block Grant Legislation," AACTE Briefs, II (March, 1981), 1, 9.

[8]David L. Clark, The Real World of the Teacher Educators: A Look to the Near Future, 18th Annual Hunt Lecture (Washington: AACTE, 1977) pp. 13-20.

[9]Ibid., pp. 24-25.

[10]Harold G. Shane, "An Educational Forecast for the 1980's," Today's Education, LXVIII (April-May, 1979), 62-65.

[11]George Neill, "Washington Report," Phi Delta Kappan, (January, 1981), pp. 394-395.

[12]David G. Savage, "Education of a New Department," Education Leadership, (November, 1980), pp. 117, 119.

[13]Neill, op. ci., pp. 395-396.

[14]Editorial, "Back to HEW," The Washington Post, August 10, 1981, p. 16A.

[15]C. Emily Feistritzer and David G. Emig, "Federal Involvement in Educational Personnel Development," Policy for the Education of Educators: Issues and Implications, ed. Georgianna Appignani (Washington: AACTE, 1981), p. 101.

[16]Spencer Rich, "The Block Grant Story," The Washington Post, August 5, 1981, p. 21A.

REFERENCES

Dwight W. Allen and Christopher Dede, Creating Better Futures for Education (Norfolk, Virginia: Old Dominion University, 1979).

Robert H. Anderson, "Financing for Teacher Education," Action in Teacher Education, II (Summer, 1980), 31-38.

David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, A Study of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers, and Change Agencies (Bloomington: Indiana University, 197).

Dean C. Corrigan, "The Future: Implications for the Preparation of Educational Personnel," The Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 100-107.

C. Emily C. Feistritzer and Clark Dobson, eds., The 1981 Report on Educational Personnel Development (Washington: Feistritzer Publications, 1981).

Robert B. Howsam and others, Educating a Profession, Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching (Washington: AACTE, 1976).

John Schwille, "Notes for a Draft of the Future," Communication Quarterly IV (Winter, 1981), 2.

B. Othanel Smith, A Design for a School of Pedagogy (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1980).

William L. Smith, Qualities of Effective Inservice Programs and the Role of Higher Education, Distinguished Lecture, National Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, Dallas, 1981.